

July 19, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/15 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300180006-4

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

16633

"He's as interested in reading a book at home as he is in reading a brief at the office," Dr. Carroll said.

Since the Australian appointment came up, Clark has become interested in Australian history and especially in Australia's "Out back"—the Australian frontier, which reminds Clark of his own Texas and American West frontier.

The giving of the collection to Southwestern doesn't end Clark's interest in Texas. He has promised Southwestern that he will continue to add to the collection the rest of his life.

"Book collecting is like a drug," Dr. Carroll summed up. "There's no cure."

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

(Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. Long of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many of us believe that the United Nations has a constructive role to play in Vietnam.

But before it can play such a role there, or anywhere, it must be put back on its feet. The present deadlock over assessments for past peacekeeping operations which has paralyzed the United Nations must be resolved. This in turn will require that Congress act as soon as possible to amend the concurrent resolution adopted last August which requires the U.S. representative at the United Nations to seek a showdown.

In an article in the current issue of *Commonweal* magazine, I attempt to set forth why Congress should modify its position on the application of article 19 and seek to create a United Nations presence in Vietnam. The text of the article follows:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

Despite the natural tendency to back the Government's policy in times of foreign difficulty, many Americans are troubled about our role in Vietnam. True, few want to pull out and leave the 18 million South Vietnamese to Communist rule by force and terror. Rather, it is the manner in which the United States has engaged itself in Vietnam that produces the uneasiness.

The United States has acted unilaterally. It is a western, and largely white nation, virtually going it alone in southeast Asia in a war which is not manifestly, or wholly, a war against foreign aggression. The United States has placed itself in a position much too reminiscent of the French in their ill-considered effort to recolonize Indo-China after World War II.

Communist China is not directly involved in the conflict, and North Vietnam does its best to disguise and deny its involvement. On the other hand, the growing U.S. participation in what many Asians and others regard as primarily a Vietnamese civil war tends to excite fears of American imperialism and to corroborate China's claim to be the champion of national liberation in Asia.

American leaders have continually pledged devotion to the United Nations as mankind's best hope of preserving peace. Yet we have signally failed to prove this devotion in southeast Asia.

In bypassing the United Nations, we are not only depriving ourselves of an opportunity to strengthen the moral, political, and military basis of our effort to preserve freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese. We are also exhibiting disrespect for the United Nations and are violating the letter

as well as the spirit of its charter, thereby undermining the peacekeeping capacity of the United Nations.

The primary purpose of the United Nations, as set forth in article I of the charter, is "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the preservation and removal of threats to the peace * * *." By ignoring the United Nations in our Vietnam policy, we frustrate this purpose.

More specifically, article 37 of the charter provides that the parties to any dispute which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security "shall refer it to the Security Council" if they fail to settle it by negotiation or other peaceful means. And if a veto blocks action by the Security Council, the General Assembly is empowered to take charge and make recommendations under the "uniting for peace" resolution.

The United Nations has acted honorably and effectively to help restore peace in other international conflicts, notably in Korea, the Middle East, the Congo, and Cyprus.

There are obvious difficulties and limitations for the United Nations in any conflict involving great powers. But great powers are no more exempt from the charter than small nations. In the Korean invasion, the United Nations acted against North Korea, the agent of the Soviet Union. In the Middle East, the world organization embarked on peace-restoring efforts over the opposition of two permanent members of the Security Council, the United Kingdom and France.

But prior to President Johnson's speech at San Francisco on June 25, spokesmen for the administration consistently deprecated all suggestions that the United Nations should play a major peace-restoring role in southeast Asia. They advanced three main arguments against a United Nations presence.

First, it was said that the U.N. could not play a useful role unless North Vietnam and Communist China agreed. This they obviously were not doing. North Vietnam's denial of the Security Council's competence to consider the Tonkin Gulf incidents last summer, and Peiping radio's condemnation of U.N. meddling were cited as evidence that the two Communist nations would not agree to a U.N. presence.

But the point is that their agreement is unnecessary. The idea that the criminal must assent to being restrained and hauled before the bar is as absurd in international peacekeeping as it would be in domestic law-enforcement. The United Nations did not seek the agreement of the North Korean aggressors before it acted in 1950. The existence or lack of North Vietnamese and Chinese acceptance of a U.N. role affects the manner in which the U.N. can operate, but it surely does not prevent it from operating.

It is equally irrelevant that neither North Vietnam nor Communist China is a member of the U.N. Article 2 of the Charter provides that "The Organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security."

A second argument against bringing the Vietnamese conflict before the United Nations is that to do so might force the Soviet Union into a vigorous defense of North Vietnam and China. Not only might this prevent a possibly useful Soviet role as a behind-the-scenes negotiator in southeast Asia; worse, it might harden up the entire post-Stalin softer Soviet line.

In truth, the Soviet Union has been subjected to very conflicting pressures over Southeast Asia. On the one hand, it has no desire to become involved in the risk of a mutually disastrous nuclear exchange with

the United States over South Vietnam. On the other hand, it must publicly take an anti-U.S. position or court further erosion of its leadership position in the Communist world. Most likely, invoking the United Nations in Vietnam would have little effect on the Soviet Union's position. She would continue to fulminate publicly against the United States. But it is by no means clear that she would vote or act against a U.S. position which was genuinely restricted to preventing the subjugation of South Vietnam by force.

A third argument is that if the Vietnam issue were brought before the U.N., U.S. policy would come in for sweeping and damaging criticism. Too many nations, it is said, regard the Vietnam conflict not as aggression but as a conflict among two segments of the Vietnamese people.

The existence of such sentiments among the countries of the free world is, in fact, an argument for taking the Vietnam conflict before the United Nations. The United States should not and need not fear debate or the exposure of the facts. By ignoring the U.N. and avoiding debate, we allow suspicions and doubts about our policies and motives to grow. By going before the U.N., we can make our point that what is at stake is the independence of small nations.

The General Assembly should respond to such an appeal. As Dag Hammarskjöld observed, it is not primarily the great powers who have need of the United Nations' capacity to protect national security. They can take care of themselves. It is the small and weak that benefit most. And these nations, I think, if squarely presented with the question, will be unwilling to see the United Nations stand by idly while a small Asian nation is undermined and engulfed.

If the United Nations takes jurisdiction over the threat to world peace which exists in southeast Asia, as the letter of the charter provides, the United States will be better off no matter what the result. We will be better off because we will have shown that our words of devotion to the U.N. are meaningful.

In short, if the United States will adopt in the U.N. a substantive position which stresses that our opposition is to violent change of Government in South Vietnam (not to peaceable change brought about by U.N.-supervised free elections there), and if we present our case plainly and well, we stand to gain from U.N. debate much more than we stand to lose.

For the past year and more, a number of voices in Congress and in the country have been urging that the United Nations be brought into the Vietnam conflict. Senators CHURCH, of Idaho, MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, have spoken up in the Senate. I have taken a similar position in the House. Thoughtful students of international affairs such as Benjamin Cohen, former counselor of the State Department and member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. have sounded the call for a U.N. presence in Vietnam. Last month the Democratic Party of Wisconsin in its annual convention at Green Bay unanimously adopted a plank urging that "the United Nations be called upon to provide a presence in southeast Asia, in order to pacify the area, conduct free elections, and sponsor its economic development."

Happily, President Johnson appears to have rejected the keep-the-U.N.-out school of thought in his speech commemorating the 20th anniversary of the United Nations on June 25 at San Francisco:

"I put to this world assembly the facts of aggression, the right of a people to be free from attack, the interest of every member in safety against molestation, the duty of this organization to reduce the dangers to

peace, and the unhesitating readiness of the United States to find a peaceful solution.

"I call upon this gathering of the nations of the world to use their influence, individually and collectively, to bring to the tables those who seem determined to make war. We will support your efforts, as we will support effective action by any agent or agency of these United Nations."

Those are fine words and a great step forward. But the speech was significant also for what the President did not say.

Two other things must be said, sooner or later: how the paralysis of the United Nations over the financial question can be resolved so that the U.N. can again act for world peace when it is called upon, and how the Vietnamese conflict is to be brought before the world organization.

The real barrier to United Nations action in southeast Asia at this time is the financial question which has turned the General Assembly into a mere debating society, incapable of action and one step ahead of bankruptcy.

The Soviet Union has refused to pay its assessments for the United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. France has refused to pay anything for the Congo operation, although it supported the Middle East force, even making voluntary contributions.

The Soviet contention is that the assessments are illegal since both operations were authorized by the General Assembly and, in their view, this power is reserved to the Security Council under the charter. The French argue that the General Assembly resolutions on financing are merely recommendatory.

An opinion of the International Court of Justice, which held that the assessments for the two peace-keeping operations were "expenses of the organization" and therefore obligatory, has failed to shake the French and Soviet positions.

By the opening of the 19th General Assembly last December, both France and the Soviet Union owed more than 2 years' assessments and, under article 19, were subject to the loss of their votes in the General Assembly.

The United States was ready to invoke article 19. Congress, with administration encouragement, had passed a concurrent resolution in August 1964, calling on the permanent U.S. delegate to the U.N. to "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19."

Russia threatened to withdraw if deprived of its vote, and there was a good chance that France would do likewise, thus raising the specter of the United Nations going the way of the League of Nations.

The result, during the 19th General Assembly, was paralysis. A clear majority of nations was determined to avoid at all costs a vote that threatened to result in a disastrous showdown. They were afraid either to apply article 19 or not to apply it, afraid of ousting Russia or of grievously offending the United States. So the world organization, set up to be an effective instrument to preserve the peace, dragged along in tragedy.

To make an unavoidable decision between two contenders for a seat on the Security Council, the president of the Assembly held "consultations" in his office. "We go into the back room and vote and then say we have not voted," one delegate remarked. But this discreditable device would not work for the long agenda of items from a troubled world before the Assembly.

A special peace-keeping committee set up to solve the problem before the convening of the 20th General Assembly in September has done no better than the Assembly itself in breaking the impasse. A June 15 deadline for some resolution came and went.

By now it should be clear that the United Nations cannot gain by a confrontation that will result either in our defeat or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization.

The United States should take the initiative in revitalizing the United Nations, based on the reality that as of today the major sovereign states simply will not be compelled to pay for peace-keeping operations which they consider harmful to their best interests. The United States should support the proposition that future peace-keeping operations be financed by voluntary contributions. In fact, only the Congo and Middle East operations have been financed by the involuntary assessments that are at the center of the current controversy. More than a dozen U.N. peace-keeping operations, including those in Korea and Cyprus, have been financed by other means. As for the past, the United States, while remaining zealous to invoke article 19 against countries in arrears on their regular U.N. dues, should not press article 19 on the Middle East and Congo special assessments.

If the 20th General Assembly is to be saved from the debilitating fate of its predecessor, the United States must act in the few weeks remaining before the Assembly convenes and Congress adjourns. Congress has to clear the way by passing a new resolution modifying Congress' injunction of last August to seek the application of article 19. A new resolution, such as I introduced in April, should provide merely that the United States continue efforts to obtain the payment of arrears by negotiation, with the hope that some scheme of voluntary contributions will prove acceptable once the attempt to require payment is abandoned.

With the United Nations revived, the way will be open for the Vietnam conflict to be brought before it. President Johnson has already declared our willingness to support any U.N. action. There remains the question of who will initiate the consideration of such action.

I would hope that one of the small powers which have the most to gain from the strengthening of U.N. security operations—Ireland, Austria, Israel, or Costa Rica—would take the lead. If not, I believe the United States itself must raise the matter before the U.N. A U.N. peacekeeping operation authorized by the General Assembly can be supported by the voluntary contributions of willing members, according to the Korean precedent.

The precise form of the U.N. operation will depend upon the circumstances at the time and the response of the North Vietnamese and their Chinese backers. Action by the United Nations calling for a cease-fire and negotiations, either at a reconvened Geneva conference or in a new setting, is a first step. The United States must assert its willingness to abide by a properly supervised cease-fire. If the Communists refuse such a cease-fire, a U.N. peacekeeping force should be stationed both on South Vietnam's borders to prevent further infiltration of men and arms from the North, and within South Vietnam itself. Undoubtedly, the United States would have to supply the lion's share of the troops and money for the operation, as in Korea. But we would still benefit, since our costs would be less than if we continue to act virtually unilaterally, and since the force would be operating under the moral umbrella of the United Nations.

As pacification of South Vietnam progressed, the United Nations would be in a far better position than the United States to assist in the development of the country without any stigma of colonialism and to supervise an eventual plebiscite in which the people of South Vietnam could freely choose their own form of government. For our part, we would have to announce our

readiness to abide by that result even if it might mean the submersion of South Vietnam into North Vietnam.

Bringing the United Nations into Vietnam is not a cure-all or an easy solution. As the mainstay of a U.N. operation, the United States will continue to be confronted with hard tasks in Vietnam. But invoking the U.N. would strengthen our military, moral, and political posture in Southeast Asia and help build the peacekeeping precedents of the U.N.

There is much to be done after San Francisco. But the foundation is laid.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON BY RICHARD N. GOODWIN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. Long of Louisiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, these past few days many of us have voiced with heavy hearts our respect and our affection for Adlai E. Stevenson.

A moving tribute to Governor Stevenson and analysis of his role in American life, written by Richard N. Goodwin, Special Assistant to President Johnson, appeared in the Washington Post on July 18, 1965. Mr. Goodwin is himself a splendid example of the generation of young Americans who were inspired by Governor Stevenson to go into public service.

The text of Mr. Goodwin's article follows:

HE NEVER LEARNED TO HIDE HIS SOUL

"We shall not come again
We never shall come back again
But over us all, over us all,
Over us all is—something."

—THOMAS WOLFE.

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Twice he had come as close as a man could come to leadership of the American Nation. Yet no one noticed as, for a moment, Adlai Stevenson looked toward the caped statue of Franklin Roosevelt, walked a few hundred yards, grasped the thin steel columns of a sidewalk railing, and died.

Questions of man's survival, of war, and of human progress had very nearly rested on the qualities of his personal mind and will. The destiny of every man and woman he passed that afternoon was almost placed in his hand. Yet no one cheered or waved or even turned to stare.

For he had escaped power. And for a politician, power is the tool which etches out one man's figure from among his companions.

IMPRESSIVE QUALITIES

Would he have been a good leader of his country, or a great one? We will never know. Many deny it. And they give reasons which start to persuade, until we remember that they—or their counterparts in other years—had said the same of past leaders such as John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt and, most violently, of Abraham Lincoln.

The fact is no man who has not been President can survive analysis of his capacity for the task. Nor can we predict his qualities until they pass through the purification of power and responsibility. We do know he had more promise than most. We do know the impressive qualities of mind and spirit his career permitted him to reveal. We also know he was ambitious. For you do not run for President unless your ambitions are greater than those of other men.

Appendix

**Growing Nationalism in Eastern Europe
Emphasized in Address by W. E. Chilton III, Knowledgeable Journalist and
Publisher of the Charleston, W. Va.,
Gazette**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the current trend among the nations of the Eastern European Communist bloc is one of growing independence and nationalism. For several years knowledgeable observers of the international scene have noted increasing indications that the ironclad control formerly exercised by the Soviet Union over her satellites is gradually relaxing.

In the West, these changes are the subject of constant analysis and discussion. Generally speaking, we tend to view as a positive sign any evidence of individual thinking or self-sufficiency on the part of nations of the bloc. We look forward to a time when self-determination will be practiced in Eastern Europe as well as in the more democratic countries.

Mr. President, a thoughtful and informative address has recently been given on this timely subject by W. E. Chilton III, president and publisher of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette. Speaking before the Rotarians of Charleston on Friday, July 16, 1965, Mr. Chilton drew from his own experiences as a member of a newspaper publisher's study group which recently toured the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Chilton believes that change must inevitably come among the Communist nations—that growing competition, the desire for profits and other indications of a turn toward capitalism are combining to speed up the process. He states that:

There is cause for thinking that eventually these nations might know an adaptation of democracy that many political theorists maintain is an imperative of popular, representative government. And, if free enterprise really takes hold in the economic arena, who knows what may happen in the more important political arena?

Mr. President, I request that the news article reporting on this significant address by Mr. Chilton be printed in the Appendix of the Record. The article appeared in the Charleston Gazette of Saturday, July 17, 1965, and was written by James F. Dent of the Gazette staff.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMUNIST UNITY SEEN FADING—EAST EUROPE "CHANGE INEVITABLE"

(By James F. Dent)

Each nation in Eastern Europe is distinct from every other nation and it isn't possible to generalize about the type of communism found in each country for the degree of control differs appreciably from nation to nation. W. E. Chilton III, president and publisher of the Gazette, told Charleston Rotarians Friday.

Earlier this year, Chilton was a member of a newspaper publisher's study group which toured the U.S.S.R. and the Communist nations of Eastern Europe.

"Let's take the subject of religion," Chilton said. "Outerbridge Horsey, the U.S. Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, told our group that the intensity of religious oppression among Soviet satellites depends on the populace of the different countries. The party, in other words, can depress religion just so much.

"In Czechoslovakia, where religious skepticism has existed for many years, religion has been greatly depressed. In Poland, the party has had to relax its control. In Rumania, in the last national elections, not only were representatives of the dominant Rumanian Orthodox, religion elected to the national assembly but so too were places reserved in the same assembly for representatives of several minority religions including, if I remember correctly, Judaism, Roman Catholicism, and Lutheran."

Economic controls also vary widely, Chilton said, "and it's quite apparent numerous capitalistic devices have been and are being introduced—even into Mother Russia."

In Yugoslavia, he said, 70 percent of the rural land is privately owned although the private owner is allowed to hold no more than about 12 acres. Private businesses also are to be found in Yugoslavia, most in the arts and native crafts industries, but no private business can employ more than five persons.

"Still," he said, "astonishing reforms have been initiated to spur collectives to produce more and better quality goods. Collectives are owned by those working for them and enjoy considerable autonomy. Some collectives even go bankrupt. Collectives compete against each other. Large wage differentials exist and, after taxes, the collective, subject to majority will, can do what it wishes with the remainder or what we'd call profit.

"Taxes are moderate—0 to 16 percent. The Yugoslav Government uses its tax powers to promote or build up certain enterprises it believes are essential to national growth. Forgiven taxes, however, must be used for expansion. They cannot supplement salaries or be paid out in bonuses."

Many of the reforms instituted by Yugoslavia are being tried in other Eastern European countries, he said, and are proving their merit with workers and consumers.

"If I'm right," he said, "that these reforms smack suspiciously of capitalistic principles of reward and punishment, there is cause for thinking that eventually these nations might know an economic adaptation of democracy that many political theorists maintain is an imperative of popular, representative government. And, if free enterprise really takes hold in the economic arena, who knows what may happen in the more important political arena?"

Chilton said he thought if the United States and Russia could reach agreement on certain issues peculiar to Europe, economic and political change would sweep through Eastern and Central and Balkan Europe. He gave five reasons for this belief.

"First," he said, "every one of these nations is experiencing a tremendous rise in nationalism and ties with the Soviet Union are loosening. Second, universal education is producing a more knowledgeable, more demanding citizenry. Third, trade and tourism are being promoted in all these nations and particularly are they desired with the West to reduce the existing hard currency shortage. Fourth, throughout Eastern Europe, the manufacturers of communism are dying off. Replacing them is a new breed of Communist, often a specialist or a technocrat, totally uninterested in politics. Fifth, the quarrel between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China isn't the only manifestation of fragmentation in the Communist world.

"Communist unity, formerly so pronounced in Eastern Europe, isn't nearly so pronounced today. Albania is allied with China. Rumania three times voted in the United Nations differently from the way the Soviets voted. Yugoslavia can be depended upon by the Soviet Union only up to a point. Polish, Czechoslovakian, and Hungarian ties with Russia have slackened and would be slackened more were the problem of the two Germanies settled."

Change is coming to Eastern Europe, he said, "and these changes will have a profound impact on the lives and on the governments of these nations and they will be for the better—for them and for us."

In Hungary last year, he pointed out, 600,000 Hungarians visited the West. "The Czechoslovakian Assistant Minister of Culture told our group that of 14 million Czechs 150,000 have put aside in special bank accounts the full purchase price of a new automobile. The Government can't gratify this demand at this time, he stated, because it has other commitments it must fulfill. Yet how long can the Government refuse to satisfy so many citizens?"

In Poland and Hungary, he said, it was possible to buy 5 days late international editions of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. He was able, he said, on the radio in his hotel room to pick up the British Broadcasting Co. programs and an American station in Munich. Pan American Airlines will shortly institute nonstop jet service between Prague and New York City.

"It is no doubt trite to say that change is coming anywhere," Chilton said, "since change is a continuing occurrence in nature and in the human condition and in institutions man establishes. However, I think few would debate the point that the world had ever previously experienced in so compacted a space in time such explosive change. How we all adjust and adapt to these explosions will determine whether the world survives.

"I would like to suggest that peaceful adaptation and adjustment depend as much on our intelligence and restraint and sensible aspirations as upon those peoples and nations we now look upon with suspicion and hostility. Indeed, I'm not so sure that from us a greater understanding will be de-

A3835

manded, since we have so much more to lose spiritually and materially."

In a question and answer period following his talk, Chilton said that Hungary appeared to be the freest nation in the eastern bloc.

He said that the "grayness" of life in the Eastern European nations varied from country to country with Poland perhaps the "grayest" of all. "Russia was grim," he said, "but after all, I was only there for 4 days and there is a tremendous language barrier. As a personal reaction, I found both West and East Berlin depressing."

In some of the eastern nations, he said, there is no formal press censorship but "the editor knows how far he can go. If he steps over the line, he'll probably be called in for a dressing down."

Russia's control of the foreign policies of the nations of the bloc differs. "There is considerable control in Poland," he said, "because the Poles still fear the Germans and want to retain close ties to their big Slavic brother."

In Rumania, control is breaking down. Russia's original intention, you know, was to turn the satellite nations into agricultural countries with industry based in Russia. But all the Eastern European nations are developing their own industries."

John W. McCormack
Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1965, Hon. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, delivered an important and informative address, entitled "Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace", before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C.

Secretary Rusk's address clearly states the justifiable reason for our policy and our presence in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia. His address is an effective presentation of our justification in terms of our national interest and in the furtherance of world peace.

Secretary's Rusk's address is also an answer to appeasers, those filled with fear and to the many people who are living in a dream world of hope—like countless of millions here and in other countries, when Hitler galloped across the horizon of world history, leaving in his wake the terrible experiences of World War II. Firm leadership in certain European countries at that time might have averted World War II but such leadership did not exist.

And firm leadership now might avert another terrible and even more destructive world conflict.

And among other things, Secretary Rusk well said:

Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

In my remarks I include the splendid address made by Secretary Rusk.

VIETNAM: FOUR STEPS TO PEACE

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here. It is a privilege for me to salute my

colleagues, present and retired, of the Foreign Service and to express to you the gratitude of President Johnson and the American people for a service which is marked by so much competence, dedication, and personal commitment.

Two and a half months ago President Johnson spoke to the world about Vietnam at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Today I wish to talk to you on the same subject—to you who know that such problems have deep roots, to you who have lived through and worked upon such problems before, and to you who know that such matters can gravely affect the future of our Nation and the prospects for general peace.

The struggle in Vietnam has continued since April and indeed has grown the more severe. The harsh resistance of the Communists to any form of discussions or negotiation continues. The effort to destroy the freedom of Vietnam has been expanded. The trial by fire of the people of Vietnam goes on. Their own resistance has been courageous, but the need for American resolution and for American action has increased.

AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The root of the trouble in Vietnam is today just what it was in April and has been at least since 1960—a cruel and sustained attack by North Vietnam upon the people of South Vietnam. Now, as then, it is a brutal war—marked by terror and sneak attack, and by the killing of women and children in the night. This campaign of terror has continued throughout the spring.

Those of us who have not served in Vietnam may find it hard to understand just how ugly this war of aggression has been. From 1961 to the present date the South Vietnamese armed forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded. In proportion to population, these South Vietnamese losses are 10 times as great as those suffered by Americans in the Korean war, and larger than our losses in World War II.

Even more terrible than these military losses are the cruelties of assassination and kidnapping among civilian officials and ordinary citizens. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians have been murdered. When an official is not found at home, often his wife and children are slain in his place. It is as if in our own country some 35,000 civic leaders or their families were to be killed at night by stealth and terror.

These are the methods of the Vietcong. This is the test to which the people of Vietnam have gallantly responded.

Meanwhile, from the north, heavy infiltration has continued. Intelligence now shows that some 40,000 had come down before the end of 1964. Toward the end of that year—well before the beginning of our own air operations against North Vietnam—the infiltration of regular North Vietnamese army units was begun, and important elements of that army are now known to be in place in South Vietnam and Laos, where they have no right to be.

And so we face a deliberate and long-matured decision by a persistent aggressor to raise the stakes of war. Apparently this was their answer to our own repeated affirmation that we ourselves did not wish a larger war. Apparently a totalitarian regime has once again misunderstood the desire of democratic peoples for peace and has made the mistake of thinking that they can have a larger war without risks to themselves. And hence the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

These actions have made infiltration harder. They have increased the cost of aggression. Without them South Vietnam today would face still stronger forces from the North.

These measured air operations have done what we expected them to do—neither more nor less. For air attack alone cannot bring peace. I cannot agree with those who think it wrong to hit the logistics of aggression. It is the aggression itself that is the wrong. Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE

The other side is obviously not yet ready for peace. In these last months, the friends of peace in many lands have sought to move this dangerous matter to the conference table. But one proposal after another has been contemptuously rejected.

We and others, for example, have sought to clear a way for a conference on Laos, and a conference on Cambodia—two neighboring countries where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam itself. But these efforts have been blocked by North Vietnam and by Communist China.

Twice there has been an effort at discussions through the United Nations—first in the Security Council after the August attacks in the Tonkin Gulf, and later this April, when Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But in August there was a refusal by Hanoi to come to the Security Council. And in April both Hanoi and Peiping made it clear that they would not receive U Thant, and both regimes made plain their view that the United Nations is not competent to deal with that matter.

Repeatedly our friends in Britain, as a co-chairman of the Geneva conference, have sought a path to settlement—first by working toward a new conference in Geneva and then by a visit of a senior British statesman. But the effort for a conference in Geneva was blocked, and the distinguished British traveler was told that he should stay away from Peiping and Hanoi.

Twice in April we made additional efforts of our own. In Baltimore the President offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping call this offer a "hoax." At that time the 17 non-aligned nations had appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. This proposal was accepted on our side. It was rejected by Hanoi and by Peiping. And some of its authors were labeled "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made constructive proposals—for an end of hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. To us this proposal was full of interest and hope. But by Hanoi and Red China it was rejected as a betrayal.

Our own Government and the Government of South Vietnam, in May, suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. This special effort for peace was denounced in Hanoi as a "wornout trick" and denounced in Peiping as a swindle. To those who complain that that so-called "pause" was not long enough, I would simply report that the harsh reaction of the other side was fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hand for more than 4 years while tens of thousands of armed men invaded the South and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed.

HANOI'S RESPONSE

Reports in the first half of June have confirmed that all these violent rejections are in fact what they appear to be—clear proof that what is wanted today in Hanoi is a military victory, not peace, and that Hanoi is not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can deter-

mine—American forces are withdrawn in advance.

So this record is clear. And there is substance in Senator Fulbright's conclusion that "It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement." For the simple truth is that there is no lack of diplomatic procedures, machinery or process by which a desire for peace can be registered—that there is no procedural miracle through which peace can be obtained if one side is determined to continue the war.

As I have said, Hanoi is presently adamant against negotiation or any avenue to peace. Peiping is even more so, and one can plainly read the declared doctrine and purpose of the Chinese Communists. They are looking beyond the current conflict to the hope of domination in all of southeast Asia—and indeed beyond.

But one finds it harder to understand Hanoi's aversion to discussion. More immediately than the Chinese, the North Vietnamese face the costs and dangers of conflict. They, too, must fear the ambitions of Communist China in southeast Asia. Yet they are still on the path of violence, insisting upon the forceful communization of South Vietnam and refusing to let their brothers in the South work out their own destiny in peace.

In recent weeks, after 2 months of reduced activity, the enemy has sharply quickened the tempo of his military action in the South. Since early May, major Vietcong units have returned to the battlefield, and already a series of sharp engagements has shown us that the fighting through the summer may be hard. Setbacks have occurred and serious defeats have been avoided only by the combination of continuing Vietnamese bravery and effective air and other types of support.

Losses on both sides have been heavy. From April first to date, we have had confirmed reports of almost 5,000 Vietcong dead, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese, and almost 100 Americans. We must expect these losses to continue—and our own losses may increase.

ROLE OF U.S. FORCES

Since March we have deployed nine battalions of fighting men to South Vietnam. Six more are on their way. For as the President said in April, "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. . . . We will do everything necessary . . . and we will do only what is . . . necessary."

Our own battalions in South Vietnam have three related tasks. Their first assignment was and is to guard such major installations as the airfield at Da Nang. A second and closely related task is that of active patrol in nearby areas. And the third is to join in combat support of Vietnamese forces—when such help is requested and when our commander, General Westmoreland, believes it should be given.

American forces so committed will carry with them the determined support of our people. These men know, as all our people know, that what they do is done for freedom and peace, in Vietnam, in other continents, and here at home.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. ACTION

In authorizing combat missions for our ground forces in Vietnam, the President acted to meet his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief. He has recognized the obligations of this Nation under the Southeast Asia Treaty, which the Senate approved by a vote of 82 to 1. He has acted under the joint resolution of August 1964, which passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2—and passed the House with no opposing vote. This resolution expresses our national readiness—as the President determines—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" and

"all necessary steps, including the use of armed force," to help Vietnam and southeast Asian members of the SEATO who ask for help to preserve their freedom.

The President has acted on the unanimous advice of the American leaders in Saigon and his senior civil and military advisers in Washington.

He has acted in full consultation with the Government of South Vietnam.

And he has acted on his own considered judgment of what is necessary at this time to stop aggression.

This decision—like all of our decisions in Vietnam—is open to review by Members of the Congress and open to reversal if it does not have their support. But the leaders of the Congress have been kept in close touch with the situation, and no such prospect should stimulate the hopes of enemies or the fears of friends. For America is not divided in her determination nor weak in her will.

In Vietnam today we face one more challenge in the long line of dangers we have, unhappily, had to meet and master for a generation. We have had to show both strength and restraint—courage and coolness—for Iran and for Greece, for Berlin, and for Korea, in the Formosa Strait, and in the Cuban missile crisis. We mean to show the same determination and coolness now.

In 1954 President Eisenhower pledged our support to the Government of Vietnam, to assist that Government, as he put it, "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." And this determination was reaffirmed again and again by President Kennedy. "We are going to stay here," he said. "We are not going to withdraw from that effort." And that is our position still.

FIRMNESS AND RESTRAINT

Now, as in April, as the President put it, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command." For it is others, and not we, who have increased the scale of fighting. It is others, and not we, who have made threats of gravely widened conflict. The firmness with which we resist aggression is matched by the firmness with which we will refrain from ill-advised adventure.

A few—a very few—may believe that unlimited war can take the place of the sustained and steady effort in which we are engaged, just as there may be a few—a very few—who think we should pull out and leave a friendly people to their fate. But the American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by the threats by others.

ROLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

This contest centers in the defense of freedom for the people who live in South Vietnam. The sustained and increasing infiltration from North Vietnam has required the measured use of air attack on military targets in the north. We alone cannot determine the future—could we do so there would be a prompt peace. The other side, too, must decide about the future. And we must hope they know—as we do—that increased aggression would be costly far beyond the worth to the aggressor.

The political turmoil in South Vietnam has continued. It is easy to be impatient with our friends in Saigon as they struggle to establish and sustain a stable government under the stress of war. We see there the ferment of a society still learning to be free, even while under attack from beyond their borders.

We must remember that this ancient people is young in its independence, restless in its hopes, divided in its religions, and varied in its regions. The turmoil of Vietnam needs the steadfastness of America. Our friends in

Vietnam know, and we know, that our people and our troops must work and fight together. Neither of us can do the work of the other. And the main responsibility must always be with, and is fully accepted by, the South Vietnamese. Yet neither of us can "go it alone." We would not be there without the urgent request for assistance from those whose land this happens to be. We have a tested faith in the enduring bravery of the people of Vietnam, and they, in turn, can count on us with equal certainty.

FORMULA FOR PEACE

The people of Vietnam long for peace. And the way to peace is clear. Yesterday the Foreign Minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles that can provide a just and enduring peace. Those principles, in summary, are:

An end to aggression and subversion. Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources.

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

Now these are the fundamental steps. This is what the arguing and the fighting is all about. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously many times, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice.

A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

And even while these hopes of peace are blocked for now by aggression, we on our side and other nations have reaffirmed our deep commitment to the peaceful progress of Vietnam and southeast Asia as a whole. In April the President proposed to the nations of Asia and to the United Nations that there be constructed a new program of support for Asian efforts and called upon Mr. Eugene Black to assist them. Now in June this work is underway. The Mekong River project has been given new life. A new dam is ready to rise in Laos. A billion-dollar bank is in the making for the development of southeast Asia. And in Vietnam itself new impetus has been given to programs of development and education and health.

So let us call again on other nations—including the Soviet Union—to join in turning this great region of the world away from the waste and violence of a brutal war. For the hope of Asia is not in relentless pressure for conquest. It is in unrelenting hope for progress—a progress in which rice production could be multiplied manifold, where the expectation of life could be doubled, the education of the young could be tenfold what it is today, and there could be an end of cholera and tuberculosis and intestinal parasites and other human afflictions.

In April the President offered determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth con-

ference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

Philadelphia Enigma—Political Probes by Grand Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the July 15, 1965, issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin contained an excellent editorial entitled, "Political Probes by Grand Jury." The questions raised by this editorial are indeed of concern to me, as they are to a great many residents of my State, and I believe other Members of Congress share this interest as well. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL PROBES BY GRAND JURY

Grand jury investigations, both Federal and county, have been singularly ineffective as inquisitorial bodies in Philadelphia in the last decade. In the nature of things, nearly all have had political overtones, in-traparty or interparty, and in the mysterious way of political matters, what seems in the beginning to be a mountain ends up by somehow becoming a molehill as far as results are concerned.

The abrupt ending of the Federal probe of alleged election frauds in the 1964 U.S. Senate Democratic primary is a good example. Chief U.S. District Judge Thomas J. Clary dismissed the jury which had been asked for by the Justice Department when, he said, it was apparent the panel would be unable to elicit any evidence justifying indictments.

The investigation grew out of the primary in which Secretary of Internal Affairs Genevieve Blatt narrowly defeated Supreme Court Judge Michael A. Musmanno, but only after vote recounts showed that Miss Blatt had been defrauded of votes taken from her and credited to Judge Musmanno by division election officials. Miss Blatt was backed by U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, and Judge Musmanno by the Democratic Organization, which Senator CLARK often opposes.

There was so much smoke that it seemed there must surely be some fire when the FBI last summer took up the investigation which county, State, and Federal prosecutors had not pursued vigorously. The Justice Department report quoted the FBI as saying that "unquestionably" there had been fraud.

It seems astounding, in view of this, that an investigation costing tens of thousands of dollars has ended in a flop.

Why were the witnesses interviewed by the FBI unable to back up their testimony before the grand jury? How could it be that these

trained investigators could report "unquestionable fraud" but that the witnesses' memories are now faulty? Why were only little people called in, and not the party leaders?

These are only a few of the questions that remain unanswered, and they will continue to trouble concerned citizens.

Memorial Rites Pay Tribute to Navy Pilot's Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of July 5, 1965:

MEMORIAL RITES PAY TRIBUTE TO NAVY PILOT'S FAITH (By Joe Stone)

The sailor with the badge of aviation boatswain's mate second class on his sleeve strode to where Mr. and Mrs. Jess M. Christian stood with family and friends in the shade of a tree in Lindo Lake Park in Lakeside.

"We from the North Island Naval Air Station honor guard," said the sailor, "want, on behalf of all U.S. Navy units and all units of the 7th Fleet afloat, to render you the honors."

With that, the sailor, Artis G. Williams, did a brisk about face and returned to the honor guard.

The silence was brief and was broken only by the sound of Williams' marching feet, but it was time enough to remember other words hurled for the first time at the world 189 years ago.

HISTORIC WORDS

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty."

And because Williams is a Negro, it was impossible not to recall the oft-repeated story of the five sons of Mrs. Bixby who gave their lives for the freedom of his ancestors, and called by Abraham Lincoln 101 years ago in his letter to their mother, "so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom."

Mr. and Mrs. Christian's sacrifice was Lt. (j.g.) Davis H. Christian, 24, their son who died fighting in the belief that the brown men of South Vietnam deserve to know freedom, the kind he knew.

Carter-Smith Post 6867, Veterans of Foreign Wars, sponsored the memorial services for Lieutenant Christian, who died when his A-4 Skyhawk jet was brought down by ground fire June 2 during a mission over North Vietnam and crashed in the ocean.

COMMANDER'S LETTER

Howard Shaff, commander of post 6867, read to the crowd a letter from Comdr. John R. DeWinter, Christian's commanding officer.

It said that Christian had almost single-handedly wiped out North Vietnam radar installations on his fatal mission and had been recommended for the Distinguished Flying Cross.

Twice previously, he had been recommended for the Air Medal, DeWinter wrote.

In his eulogy to the Lieutenant, Rev. Orval C. Butcher of Wesleyan Methodist Church, Lemon Grove, read words the young man

had written before his death, while flying in combat.

"I wouldn't trade places with anyone."

"I would not feel cheated if my life were taken soon."

"I am once again inspired to the ministry."

"The world is a mess. I still aspire to the ministry."

On the leaves of his Bible:

"This Book is dedicated to rebuilding the personality of man and this goal will be realized, one way or another."

CRITICAL NOTE

A letter written to his parents by Christian and published 2 days after his death had criticized Americans who wanted to abandon South Vietnam to Communist dictatorship.

The letter was tolerant of college students, from whose ranks Christian had been graduated 2 years ago.

"I know how uninformed most of them really are—how they want to be noticed * * *," he said.

TRAITS DESCRIBED

The parents, three sisters, and a brother heard Christian described by John Westrick, principal of Lakeside Junior High School, and Rev. Theodor E. Roberts, Jr. of Lakeside Community Presbyterian Church, as a student, athlete, singer, musician, and practicing Christian.

The Reverend Mr. Roberts epitomized Christian's love of flying and religious belief with the World War II poem:

"I have slipped the surly bonds of earth * * * and touched the face of God."

Canadian Arts Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have an opportunity to vote on a bill (H.R. 9460) creating a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. The bill was reported on July 14.

In the Washington Post for July 18 there was a timely article, written in connection with the appearance of Canadian dance companies at Carter Barron, describing the splendid work of the Canadian Arts Council, which helps support the creative and performing arts in Canada with financial grants. Our present arts council, created by Public Law 88-579, has no authority to make grants. Recognizing that a grant program is necessary in order to permit the arts and the humanities to flourish, the National Council on the Arts, at its initial meeting early this spring, adopted a resolution approving the present legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks, the article on the Canadian Arts Council which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

CANADIAN COUNCIL BOOSTING DANCE

(By Jean Battey)

Two Canadian dance companies will be seen here this summer at Carter Barron: Les Feux Follets, a Canadian folk dance group, open a week's engagement Monday evening and the National Ballet of Canada will start its 2-week stand August 2.

Regrettably, at this time of challenge some of our citizens, though well-intentioned they may be, go about the country sowing seeds of doubt, disunity, and distrust.

To them, our military efforts are unworthy, all military sacrifices in vain.

These peace-marchers find safety in slogans but remain blind to the ancient saying: "It is madness for the sheep to talk peace with a wolf."

Let's take a very brief look at some history.

Were it not for the military power of America generously given in 1941 through 1945, we would not be living today as free men; and those who talk so glibly of disarmament and peace would lack the freedom to speak at all.

The same can be said of 1917 when the Kaiser was overwhelming Europe—until the day came when the men of the United States answered the call of those who sought liberty.

Down through the years, time and again, as diplomacy has broken down and the desires of some men to rule and dominate others has led them to the use of force, it has been a responding force that has preserved the freedom of us all.

Were it not for our military power today, does anyone doubt that the Communists would now control all South Vietnam? Cambodia? Thailand? Malaysia? Indeed, all the 600 million people in southeast Asia?

Were it not for our Armed Forces, how long would the Communist allow Berlin to remain even half free, or how much freedom would there be in Western Europe?

What knowledgeable and fair-minded person doubts that, had it not been for President Johnson's quick decision and fast action, Santo Domingo would at this moment be another Cuba?

He who has eyes, should see. He who has ears, should listen, and he who has a mind, should understand that the forces of communism still threaten the freedom of mankind today just as much as they did in 1941 or 1950 or 1962.

Of course, everyone craves peace, but when tigers are prowling, it is no time to be passing out leaflets.

The United States of America was born in a citizens' military revolution.

Six times in our history tyranny has threatened to destroy us. Six times, young men have answered the call.

And the good that has resulted from six victories is attested by there being more freedom, better education, more prosperity, better health, and higher standards of living for all in the United States, as well as in the free world.

Today, once again, freedom rests upon the military strength and the moral commitments of America.

But we are at present under heavy indictment, accused by our enemies, and more regrettably by some of our friends, of pursuing an ill-fated jingoistic course.

Yet facts show we have sought, and are seeking now with every available means, every possible way to bring these confrontations to the conference table.

For surely, Americans seek no new territory, no domain, no dominion, no rule, no authority, over any other lands nor any other people.

But for a certainty, we seek now and will in the future a peace—but always a worthy peace, a peace with honor.

Over the course of recent generations, we have learned that to gain these precious goals we must first respect our own contracts, our own commitments. And then those who would destroy freedom must be made to understand that in respecting our commitments, we will once again follow the steps of our forefathers—we will fight for freedom. We will not quit under pressure, nor surrender under attack.

To you young men, I would say that you have assumed enormous responsibility, for you have taken on the task of leadership, and you do it at a time of danger and uncertainty.

But the sum of your responsibility is the hope and strength of America—and in fact the free world.

You can be proud of the course you will follow. Men of courage and determination have preceded you. You walk in the spirit of every revolutionary whose name is emblazoned on the pages of time.

California Agriculture Must Not Be Allowed To Become Union's Football Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Filipino descent are among our finest citizens. For many decades, Filipino-Americans have worked in California agriculture—in every capacity—from stoop-labor fieldhands to grower-employers. They know California specialty crop agriculture as well as any other group. California agriculture, and the standard of living of the farmworker, are much the better for the individual and collective contributions of Filipino-Americans over a period of many years. We must respect men who are willing to compete with anyone in the basis of skill and who show sincere desire to earn good wages for themselves and a profit for their employers. They deserve to be heard on the subject of the current crisis of California farms.

Mr. Speaker, the Bataan News, M. H. Jacaban, managing editor and publisher, is the principal voice of Filipino-Americans in California. Naturally, they have a special interest in the preservation of California agriculture and in all who produce and consume California fruit and vegetables.

For the above reasons, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include at this point in my remarks an editorial which appeared in the July 4, 1965, edition of the Bataan News entitled, "California Agriculture Must Not Be Allowed To Become Union's Football Field." The full text of the editorial follows:

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO BECOME UNION'S FOOTBALL FIELD

Some 3 or 4 years ago the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, with its headquarters in Stockton, had decided to organize the farmworkers. Public Law 78 was in the way of their organizing scheme, so the AFL-CIO, to which AWOC is affiliated, bent all its efforts in having that supplemental law ended. That is when the football game between the growers and the union started, with Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz as the nonpartisan referee for the match.

AWOC has always claimed that with attractive wages, the unemployed domestic workers could be attracted to work on the farms. They claim that enough farm labor force could be recruited to harvest the crops which represent a \$4 billion industry. AWOC had demanded and got U.S. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to set \$1.40 per hour

for the farmworker. The \$1.40 per hour wage, due to the fact that the Labor Secretary has no legal right to set minimum wage, is illegal, but the California growers are forced to go along with the order.

What happened though is quite a damaging fiasco. In spite of the \$1.40 per hour wage, AWOC has not been able to recruit enough men to adequately harvest the spring crops. Strawberries in the Salinas area were left on the vines to rot from want of workers to pick them. That represented a loss of millions of dollars gone for naught. Then thousands of acres in asparagus in the San Joaquin and Sacramento delta areas have not been harvested because of no able and willing workers to cut them. That represents approximately \$1 million loss every day for about 90 days of harvest season.

The gullible public has been made to believe by the AWOC that there are hundreds of thousands of our domestic workers that are out of work, and for that reason there is no need for foreign workers to supplement our agricultural work force. The fact is that the unemployed that the union counted on to compose the farm labor force are the winos and the lazy people who do not want to work. These kind of people are not able to do the strenuous stoop labor jobs, and I do not see why the union is insisting that these people be employed in agriculture. The other industries would not have them; why penalize the growers by insisting that they use them in their operations? It does not figure; agriculture needs men that are both mentally and physically fit to do the jobs on the farm.

Because there are still about 10,000 Filipinos in California who are directly or indirectly dependent for their bread and butter on agriculture, this bloc of workers becomes very important as far as the question of unionization or nonunionization of the farmworkers is concerned. This bloc of workers will have to be reckoned with in the final solution of the critical farm labor dilemma California agriculture has been forced to face.

As for the Bataan News, it has been its consistent basic policy for the last 22 years that, because it had provided employment for our Filipino people in the last 50 years, California agriculture must not be allowed to forfeit its position as No. 1 economy of California just to accommodate the selfish design of any union. We maintain that the present laws of this country are tailored for nonperishable goods, and invoking these laws in agriculture will surely bring ruin to the industry.

For example, our present laws allow strikes by the unions at any time. These laws, if applied to nonperishable goods industries, such as steel, automobile industries, etc., are not going to completely ruin the industry because their products would not rot. But if the same laws are applied to agriculture and allow the unions to strike at the time when the crops are ready to harvest, the crops will completely go to waste.

Unless there are laws that definitely will protect the agricultural industry from unscrupulous unionists we definitely believe in the policy of let well enough alone. This policy is, we believe, for the good of everybody. It allows the continuance of the production of foods so that the whole public will not be forced to pay exorbitant prices for their foods. We are taxed to death already. It is also good for the unions. Agriculture has been the biggest employer in California, and if agriculture is going to be hurt because of the selfish design of any union it follows that there will be unemployment. No grower, no worker. No worker, no union either. It is as simple as that.

As for the Filipino farmworker, he is a highly skilled worker who will stick his finger on his nose if he is offered the \$1.40 per hour wage. He works on a piecework rate; in

that way he makes around \$3.50 per hour. He is also smart enough to negotiate for himself with his employer; he is, because of his skill and experience, highly wanted, and for that reason union representation is hardly necessary.

The final solution of the California agriculture's dilemma is not to cut off foreign supplemental labor, but to encourage it in such crops like asparagus, strawberry, dates, citrus, melons, etc., in which our able and willing domestic workers could not adequately perform.

Let us remember that California agriculture supplies 41 percent of the Nation's foods and fibers, and if something happens to disrupt that supply, every housewife in America will feel the impact of higher cost of foods. You know, football players wear cleats, if we let the unions make California agriculture their football field, they will trample the crops to smithereens and you and I will have to pay for such a folly.

United States Apologetic About Food It Gives to Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the continued expansion of the war in Vietnam drives home the seriousness of the all-out battle against freedom being waged by the Communist world, a column by Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, which appeared in this morning's edition, is especially pertinent and timely in nature. It is my hope that administration foreign affairs experts would ponder Mr. Trohan's words.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 19, 1965]
UNITED STATES APOLOGETIC ABOUT FOOD IT
GIVES TO COMMUNISTS
(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Food has been virtually neglected as a weapon in the cold war and as a powerful force for peace.

Communists nations can't feed themselves. The United States produces more than it can consume and has had to spend billions on subsidies and storage of surplus.

Instead of making a case for capitalism against communism on food production, the United States is apologetic about sending food behind the Iron Curtain, as though it were ashamed of the system under which it does so well. Bleeding hearts among us want American food distributed through the United Nations, so that the international organization gets the credits rather than the American way.

The world as a whole is running low on food production. As populations rise, the situation will worsen. Instead of using food production as an argument for the capitalist system, the United States is bending every effort at conciliation with a system that can't feed its people.

When the United States does give food and dole out resources under foreign aid, it does so in such a way as to encourage people seeking relief from totalitarianism to believe that we are on the side of their leaders.

BARRED FROM HOSPITAL UNITED STATES BUILT
The United States poured billions into Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Po-

land. The people see this as entrenching their Communist bosses rather than helping the people to achieve freedom.

Recently the Polish Communists refused to permit Vice President HUMPHREY and a congressional delegation to attend the dedication of an \$11 million children's hospital the United States has built in Krakow.

There is growing recognition within the Government, especially those departments and agencies concerned with diplomacy and agriculture, that the role of food in promoting peace has been neglected. A long, hard look is being taken at existing programs. This has given rise to consideration of releasing agriculture from rigid controls.

The value of food in promoting peace, coupled with mounting farm organization protests against regimentation of agriculture, may work in time to release farmers from production straitjackets and supervision.

No doubt it won't happen overnight or even over the next year or before the next presidential campaign, yet, it is possible the trend away from socialism and welfare statism may begin by freeing farmers from existing controls.

A FARM REVOLUTION IN REVERSE

Before any steps can be taken, the United States will have to determine just what the foods needs will be of soaring populations and what part of that needed food supply the United States could meet under its surplus producing know-how and mechanization.

Experts contend that it is obvious whatever goal is determined will be higher than existing production, so that ceilings will have to be lifted on productive capacity. With the lifting of ceilings will come a release from existing controls.

The extent of release is being debated by planners for the future. It is possible that the Government would maintain only a minimum floor under farm prices and leave farmers free to choose what to plant and to sell in a free market.

What is being talked of is a farm revolution in reverse. It is still too early to say how far it will go, but it is a long step even to consider employing food production as a propaganda tool and a lever for promotion of peace.

Shaping Our Long-Range Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have been urging the Congress to assume its rightful role in participating in the shaping of our long-range foreign policy, particularly with reference to the continuing and expanding conflict in southeast Asia.

I remain convinced that the vast majority of the American people will support whatever must be done to achieve our goal of ending Communist aggression and subversion against South Vietnam, and then of attempting to work out some honorable and satisfactory arrangement under which its citizens will be left free to choose and shape their own destiny.

So far, so good—but, though the American people undoubtedly understand that

this is our primary goal and overwhelmingly approve of it, I am not at all convinced that they have, as yet, any clear idea of how long it may take to reach such a result nor of what may be eventually demanded of them along the way.

One of the reasons why this is so is that, up to now at least, most of the initiative for what has been happening in Vietnam has rested with the aggressor. The future course of the conflict is almost impossible to predict for the same basic reason and, as long as this condition prevails, I think the uneasiness here at home over this new and strange kind of a "war," and the uncertainty about what we are getting into, is bound to increase to the detriment of both our real and our apparent national resolution.

I am convinced, as I have said before on several occasions, that the American people need and deserve to be told, fully and frankly, why this war must be fought and why it must be won—"won" in the sense, that is, that the President now defines our possibility of success in achieving our underlying goal—and I am also convinced that they need and deserve to be told, with equal fullness and frankness, what the cost of such success may be to them.

Until this has been done, I fear that the seeming contradiction that may exist, here, between what the American people want, and what they are willing to pay for, will continue—and, for so long as that is so in any degree, the posture of the United States, in southeast Asia or elsewhere, is not one of full strength.

In my judgment, the President must bear the primary responsibility for improving this situation. To a degree, after a rather long period of comparative silence, he has been attempting to do so. But I do not think that press conferences, nor "off the record" discussions with either congressional leaders or representatives of the news media, or intentional leaks about the possibility of troop callups and so on, constitute proper vehicles for him to use for such purposes.

The best and, traditionally and constitutionally, the proper vehicle to which the President should turn is the Congress itself—as I think, eventually, he will have to do. And, if I am correct in this assessment, Mr. Speaker, then the sooner the better for all concerned.

And, now, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I submit for the consideration of my colleagues the following newspaper comments, the first an editorial from the July 16, 1965, edition of the Christian Science Monitor, and the second a column by Tom Wicker as appearing in the New York Times on the same date:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 16, 1965]

ALL THE FACTS ON VIETNAM

Now that the U.S. Government has made it clear that it is determined to achieve in Vietnam those military ends which it believes are right and necessary, Washington faces three moral and practical obligations. The first of these is to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won. The second is to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them. The third is to win that

war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity.

Although we understand and sympathize with the difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which President Johnson faces over Vietnam, we do not believe that any one of these three obligations are yet being met. Washington's explanations on American involvement in Vietnam have left far too many Americans (to say nothing of the rest of the world) confused, doubtful and in many cases even indignant. Washington has deliberately refrained from telling the American people what the White House and the Pentagon well know: the cost of victory will be high, the road to victory hard and probably long. Finally, the present American build-up of troops, bases and material in Vietnam may not be adequate for even a long-drawn-out effort at victory, to say nothing of a swift and decisive effort to end the conflict.

At any time, anywhere, and under any circumstance war is a heart-rending human tragedy. But once a war is begun, the wisest and most merciful procedure is to win that war as quickly as is consistent with every humane consideration left the warrior.

Nor will anything be gained by failing to be utterly frank with the American people. If Vietnam is to require larger armed forces, a call-up of Reserve units, new military appropriations, the sooner and more fully the American people are told of this the better. At present, this news is coming out in dribs and drabs, in hints, in "leaked" stories and in other roundabout ways. It is little wonder that the American people seem uncertain and confused about what is going on.

We believe that the American aims of preserving South Vietnam's independence, of halting outside aggression and of seeking a negotiated peace with honor and justice are right. But we also believe that these may well require greater sacrifices than Washington has yet admitted. It is high time that the White House made this plain.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 16, 1965]

WASHINGTON: HOW DEEP IS THE RIVER?
(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—In the early days of his Presidency, Lyndon Johnson is supposed to have remarked that his support in the country was like a western river—wide but shallow. The remark probably had no special relevance to the specific question of his policy in South Vietnam, but in the months and years ahead the depth of that particular river may be thoroughly tested.

The best efforts of poll takers and the informed opinion of reporters and others who move around the country agree that the Nation is supporting the expanded war in South Vietnam and believes with Mr. Johnson that the United States must stick to its guns against the Communist guerrillas.

THE GOOD PEOPLE

It is likely also, however, that the majority of the good people pursuing their business from here to the Pacific coast do not have a detailed understanding of what is going on, what is at stake, and what could happen in remote southeast Asia. In such a complex situation the people have rallied round the President, taken his word and advice, and acquiesced in his management of things.

In the postwar world, moreover, it has not been difficult to mobilize American opinion around an anti-Communist position, and it always has been easy to evoke the patriotic fervor of Americans when their flag and their boys are under fire.

But wars involving mass societies in the 20th century with its instant communications and propaganda techniques are most easily sustained when there is a clear-cut objective. Franklin Roosevelt's demand for "unconditional surrender" of the Axis Powers may have been unwise in the long view, but

it provided the American people with a visible and definable target, and they aimed at it unanimously and wholeheartedly.

The trouble with the war in Vietnam is that Lyndon Johnson can provide no such attractive terminal goal. There is no real battlefront to be stabilized at a certain line. There is no lost and occupied territory to be regained. There is not even a clearly visible enemy command to be brought to its knees and relieved of its swords.

NO RINGING SLOGANS

It is not surprising, therefore, that this repugnant war has produced no rising slogans and no confident definitions of victory. And that may be why, despite the evident general support for the President's policy, the Vietnamese war has sickled o'er the American sky with the pale cast of uneasiness. People want something tangible to fight for.

This and earlier administrations have worked hard to provide it. A clear and consistent American goal has been to achieve an end to aggression and subversion against South Vietnam.

Beyond that is diplomatic murk, although the South Vietnamese Government, with the endorsement of Dean Rusk, has set forth these additional fundamental principles for a just and enduring peace:

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape its own destiny without outside interference; an end to South Vietnamese military action and the withdrawal of all foreign troops; and effective guarantees for independence and freedom for the South Vietnamese people.

Mr. Rusk added that if these principles were realized, North and South Vietnam could proceed to a free decision on the question of reunification.

That would not appear to rule out government participation by South Vietnamese Vietcong elements, as distinguished from North Vietnamese infiltrators. It does not necessarily reject the idea of international guarantees partially shared by Communist powers. It at least opens the possibility of South Vietnam being voted by all of Indochina into a Communist or Titoist government as a part of reunification.

Mr. Johnson probably has to float these notions before Hanoi, Peking and Moscow, as well as the Vietcong themselves, if he is to keep open the faint prospect that they eventually might consider the conference table more promising or less punishing than the jungle.

OUR BARGAINING POSITION

But he cannot concede such points in advance without destroying his bargaining position in southeast Asia—a position that already needs plenty of improvement. Nor is it likely that he can foresee whether any or all of these arrangements might become necessary or impossible or even advantageous.

So there is not, and probably can't be, any inspiring and precise definition of what the war is all about. As the casualty list lengthens, this might turn Mr. Johnson's river into a dry gulch unless the American people understand that the problem is not so simple as bringing down Hitler or getting the missiles out of Cuba.

Any Trade With Reds Helps Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Alhambra Post Advocate of July 13, 1965,

perceptively editorialized on the problems of trade with the Communist bloc.

The editorial serves to deflate this administration's extensive campaign designed to promote an increase in East-West trade as virtually a political and economic panacea to the cold war.

As the editorial concludes:

One of the greatest cold war ironies is that the free world does not recognize the threat or ignores it to trade with the Russians in the mistaken belief that it enhances the cause of peace.

Unless there is more recognition of this fact, we could become the tools of our own destruction.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the San Gabriel Valley (Calif) Post Advocate, July 13, 1965]

ANY TRADE WITH REDS HELPS FOE

One of the most futile exercises in semantics of our generation is whether a distinction can be made between strategic and non-strategic goods so far as trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites is concerned.

Without the trade from the free world, the Soviet Union could not have reached the position of influence and power she wields today. Whether wheat or machinery, trade to the Soviets is a political weapon for Marxist domination and as such is strategic.

The value of trade with the free world to the Soviets was clearly outlined recently in a speech by B. F. Coggan, an executive of the National Security Industrial Association, who has traveled extensively in Russia.

"Russia," he said, "has come to the realization that she cannot exist unto herself and she must enter the world marketplace. We now see Marxism turning outward and making a direct contact with the free world through the window of trade."

"Russia will now try to market her products worldwide in an effort to enlarge Marxist influence throughout the world. She believes that world trade will gain her time to overtake the economic progress of capitalistic countries . . . We therefore now see the Soviet leaders attaching a very special importance to opening up trade with the United States."

One of the greatest cold war ironies is that the free world does not recognize the threat or ignores it to trade with the Russians in the mistaken belief that it enhances the cause of peace.

Unless there is more recognition of this fact, we could become the tools of our own destruction.

Busiest Executive—"Mr. Boston"—42 Affiliations for Ralph Lowell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the recent edition of Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors, and Executives shows that the Nation's busiest executive is a remarkable Bostonian, Ralph Lowell.

Mr. Lowell serves as chairman of the Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., but he is also a director or officer of 41 other corporations.

In addition to all of these activities, Mr. Lowell is a noted patron of the arts in Boston and has built the Lowell Fund, organized to assist Harvard students from \$238,000 to \$2 million.

Ken McKenna, of the New York Herald Tribune, wrote an interest profile of Mr. Lowell and I would like to share it with the House by inserting it in the RECORD: **BUSIEST EXECUTIVE—"MR. BOSTON"—42 AFFILIATIONS FOR RALPH LOWELL**

(By Ken McKenna)

This year Ralph Lowell somehow is dividing his working hours between Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co. and 41 other corporations and institutions where he is an officer or director.

As such, the 74-year-old Bostonian became the busiest corporate executive in the United States for 1965.

Mr. Lowell, who is chairman of Boston Safe Deposit, added 12 new affiliations this year, thereby taking the lead over last year's busiest director, Washington Businessman George E. Allen. Mr. Allen, famed as the joke-telling friend of U.S. Presidents, ran second this year.

This information concerning the public life of top executives emerged from the 1965 edition of "Poor's Register of Corporations, Directors and Executives." The 3,810-page volume, weighing 13 pounds, was published yesterday by Standard & Poor's Corp.

Among the facts of business life emerging from the publication:

The average age of top-level corporate officers and directors is increasing rather than decreasing. An age study of the listed 71,327 men indicated the average age of executives has increased by 4 percent over last year.

With a possible boost from the space age, Massachusetts Institute of Technology moved into the leading 10 colleges and universities attended by corporate executives and directors. Harvard was an easy first, with 4,135 company officers listed. Following were Yale, Princeton, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Busiest woman executive was Mary A. McCravy, secretary of Georgia-Pacific Corp., who is also an officer and/or director of 23 related companies.

Standard & Poor's candidate for the year's most active executive is a member of the renowned New England Lowell family. Often identified as "Mr. Boston," he has demonstrated over the years a surprising range of interests.

LONG LIST

His affiliations include John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., as a director; New England Medical Center, treasurer; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, life member of the corporation; Massachusetts Historical Society, trustee, and Salvation Army Association, treasurer.

He is also a director of Republic Steel Corp., Avco Corp., American Brewing Co., Park Sheraton Corp., and S. Klein Department Stores.

A lover of cultural pursuits, he was an early advocate of educational television (commercial television plays "down to amuse; we play up to stimulate or instruct," he once said).

Recently he backed a proposal that the conservative Boston Museum of Fine Arts buy a Picasso painting and Brancusi sculpture, commenting, "Now, I don't believe in all this modern stuff myself, but I'm not always right."

As a financial figure, his batting average has been high. In the 37 years he managed the Lowell Fund, organized to assist students at Harvard, its assets grew from \$238,000 to \$2 million.

His major concern is Boston Safe Deposit & Trust, of which he is chairman. He de-

scribes the trust bank, oldest of the chartered trust companies in the United States, as "a bank with a conscience."

Mr. Lowell earned a Phi Beta Kappa key at Harvard, graduating in the class of 1912 with Robert Benchley, Frederick Lewis Allen, and Joseph P. Kennedy. The executive, a member of the seventh generation of his family to attend the college, was later elected president of the Harvard University Board of Overseers. "When we say college here, we mean Harvard," he said a few weeks ago, "I can't think of any Lowells who didn't go."

OLDER

At 74, Mr. Lowell is in an age category that increased this year in "Poor's Register" of active executives. Some 8,303 executives were listed in the 71-to-80 bracket, almost 1,000 more than last year.

The number of working businessmen over 80 also rose, by 50 percent to 1,402. In the younger categories, the number of executives declined. Only 59 percent of the officers and directors listing their age (4,541 omitted this fact) were in the 21-to-60 area, compared with 63 percent in 1964.

The Register is shadowy on one point. Harold L. Wyman, Standard & Poor's senior vice president in charge, pointed out that the count of women executives (1,284) was based on those positively identified as such.

There is reason to believe, he said, a great number of women conceal their sex by reporting only initials.

Sportsmen Must Bypass Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 13, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a grim warning appearing in the Pennsylvania Game News published monthly by the Pennsylvania Game Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania entitled "Sportsmen Must Bypass Philadelphia."

Citizens across the Nation are concerned about the kind of irresponsible legislation directed at firearms and law-abiding citizens.

The legislation referred to is an ordinance of the city of Philadelphia requiring that all sporting arms purchased, transferred, or brought into the city, including rifles and shotguns, be registered and may not be legally possessed in the county without first presenting the owner's name, address, fingerprints, photograph, and serial number to the Philadelphia Police Department accompanied by a registration fee of \$1.

Firearms not so registered may be confiscated and the owner fined.

This is simply an example of the direction in which legislation such as H.R. 6628, H.R. 1783, S. 14, and the so-called Dodd bill, S. 1591, and S. 1592, is taking this Nation:

BECAUSE OF NEW GUN LAW SPORTSMEN MUST BYPASS PHILADELPHIA
(By Charles H. Nehf)

Philadelphia, the birthplace of American Democracy, is now in the onus position of

also giving it "the kiss of death." The very implication of the ridiculous new restrictive gun law which went into effect April 15 now strikes at the very heart of human privileges granted in the constitution of the United States.

The Philadelphia law now requires that all sporting firearms purchased, transferred or brought into the city, including rifles and shotguns, be registered and may not be possessed legally in the county without first presenting the owner's name, address, fingerprints, photograph and serial number to the Philadelphia Police Department. Registration fee is \$1. Incidentally guns not so registered may be confiscated and the owner fined.

"This law," as stated by an official of the Pennsylvania Game Commission, "will impose serious hardships on both the honest resident sportsman and on the visiting hunter or target shooter who is temporarily in, or passing through the city."

"Out-of-State sportsmen are particularly cautioned to keep this in mind when traveling through the city of Philadelphia. The transportation of unregistered firearms through Philadelphia constitutes a violation. It should be emphasized that this is not a Pennsylvania law, but applies only in the city of Philadelphia."

PUSHING OUTWARD

In some of the initial discussion of the bill, the mayor of Philadelphia and councilmen expressed the hope that similar laws would be imposed by the counties of Bucks, Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery. The heat is now on and overtures have already been made to the county commissioners in the districts surrounding Philadelphia.

Just where does this leave the honest law-abiding sportsman? It places him out in left field so far that he isn't even in the ball game anymore.

The sportsmen, as repeated many times over, are as much concerned with crime as anyone. Our position is that absolutely no amount of laws for registering sporting arms can and will reduce crimes. Philadelphia and every other part of the country will continue to have major crimes at gunpoint, in spite of all the laws in the book.

Do criminals register firearms? The answer to that question is only too obvious.

Let us just examine a few of the nasty situations which now arise under this absolutely worthless gun law:

1. Sets up an autocratic police department: The issuance of permits to transport, own or transfer sporting firearms now rests in the hands of a bureaucracy which smacks on the border of autocracy. God forbid, but the first place that all dictators in Europe went to disarm the people was to the bureau of arms registration. Once the public is deprived of lawful arms then we become the victims of might.

Over a recent weekend my wife and I spent 3 days at beautiful Williamsburg, Va. Among many impressions, you just can't help but realize that the very basis for the existence of the United States is the result of an armed citizenry.

2. Avoid Philadelphia airports in making your trip west: Sportsmen of the Lehigh Valley must now forget the Philadelphia Airport and arrange their big game hunting trips to the Far West and Alaska here at the Allentown Airport. TWA and United now have direct routes out of Allentown and you can pick up your jet accommodations at either Pittsburgh or Chicago.

3. Bypass Philadelphia on your waterfowl trips to the shore: The hundreds of Lehigh Valley sportsmen who use the Schuylkill Expressway and Walt Whitman Bridge to the shore for waterfowl hunting must now give Philadelphia a wide berth. The couple of bucks we poured into eating meals along the way will be spent elsewhere.

operated it for 10 years. In 1937, he ran for office for the first time, seeking a seat in Congress. He lost, but has never been defeated since. One year later he was elected a U.S. Representative and has been in Congress ever since.

COAUTHORED REORGANIZATION ACT

Representative MONRONEY made his mark in a hurry in Washington. While only in his fourth term, he won the 1945 Collier's Award for Distinguished Congressional Service. He became a specialist in the organization of Congress and with Senator Robert M. La Follette, Republican, of Wisconsin, co-authored the Reorganization Act of 1946 which streamlined Congress.

Nearly two decades later, the organization of Congress is still a major interest of MONRONEY. He now serves as cochairman of the Joint Committee on Reorganization of Congress, which is attempting to update the 1946 law and achieve needed reforms. Hearings have been held and prospects are excellent for another enactment.

In 1950, MONRONEY challenged veteran Senator Elmer Thomas, Democrat, of Oklahoma, for his seat. He beat Thomas in the primary, easily defeated a Republican opponent in the November election, and has been a Senator ever since. His present term does not expire until 1968.

Aviation has been a major legislative interest of MONRONEY. He was the author of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which established the Federal Aviation Agency. Six other aviation laws are credited to him, and he has been awarded the Wright Brothers Trophy for service to aviation and the Tony Jannus Prize for his contributions to the scheduled airline industry.

His aviation activities have stemmed from his membership on the Senate Commerce Committee, and heading its Aviation Subcommittee. He is also the chairman of the Automotive Marketing Subcommittee and was the author of the Automobile Labeling Act of 1958, requiring window stickers to disclose the factory price of new cars.

Senator MONRONEY is also a member of the potent Appropriations Committee. He heads its Legislative Subcommittee and serves on five other subcommittees, including the one handling funds for the Post Office Department. Obviously he is a mighty busy legislator, often supposed to be at two or three meetings at the same time.

HAS INDEPENDENT VIEWS

Senator MONRONEY made it plain during his NEA interview that he will not simply rubberstamp postal legislation sent up to him from downtown. He has a questioning attitude. He does not pretend to know all the answers and he will reserve judgment on some issues until he hears the facts.

Take the ZIP code, for example. He called it "a good effort" but he does not know whether its full-scale use will actually speed mail delivery. He thinks it should be tested for delivery results "after it has been in the woodwork long enough." He has named a subcommittee to study ZIP code.

Soon after MONRONEY became chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent to Congress a Federal pay increase bill. This will be handled by MONRONEY's committee. He is for a salary raise but against one novel feature of the White House proposal—to allow semiautomatic increases in pay in future years without congressional action.

Publishers concerned about their postage rates will be glad to know that Chairman MONRONEY does not favor combining postal pay and postal rate increases in a single bill. "I think they should be separate," he told NEA.

Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy both linked pay rate increases on the theory that if postal workers got a

raise, users of the mails should pay this added cost through higher rates. The last two rate increases have combined a pay and a rate bill. It is good news that Senator MONRONEY objects to this practice, as does NEA and every other mail user group.

DUBIOUS ABOUT PRIORITY MAIL

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski has announced plans to seek legislation to establish a "priority mail" service, combining first class and airmail. Presumably this would mean the end of 5-cent letters and 8-cent airmail, and the substitution of a priority mail rate of 6 or 7 cents. The Post Office would use trains or planes to transport mail, whichever would give better service.

Senator MONRONEY is interested in better service but he is not so sure that ending airmail is the answer. He is not against the Gronouski plan, he just wants the facts laid on the line before he makes a decision. This is a typical attitude for the new head of the postal committee. He is a bearcat for facts and does not jump to conclusions.

Mechanization of the postal service is another subject on which the Oklahoma legislator remains to be convinced. If economical and practical, he is for it but he believes it can be overdone. He cited a personal experience with mailing eight wedding presents, every one of which was broken in the mails. He blamed machine handling for the breakage.

On the other hand, Senator MONRONEY agrees with most mail user groups that the Post Office Department "has been niggardly in asking for research and development funds and Congress has been niggardly in giving research dollars" to the POD. In his position, on the Appropriations Committee, MONRONEY is in a strategic spot to influence Post Office thinking on mechanization.

SEES RATES AS CONTROVERSIAL

Senator MONRONEY is a veteran of the postal rate wars. He knows all the arguments on both sides. He has supported rate increases when he felt they were needed, but at the same time he has exerted his considerable influence for moderation in the amounts. It would be a good guess that this would be his attitude in the future.

He does not know whether the Johnson administration plans to propose a rate increase. He will cross that bridge when he comes to it. But there is one key preliminary he hopes to get out of the way before the next rate bill comes along. He wants an independent cost study made by a top accounting firm. He has discussed this matter with the PMG.

When the 1962 rate increase was on its way through Congress, the Senate Post Office Committee wrote into its report that a full study of costs should be made before another rate increase was considered. MONRONEY regrets this research has not been done and hopes to arrange it in the future. "It should have been done last year," he told NEA.

Serrill raised with Senator MONRONEY the problem of the "dilution of second-class mail"—the granting of second-class entry to publications which do not deserve the privilege. While Senator MONRONEY was unaware that a wall map had been granted second-class entry, he did know of the situation in general and promised to help "clean up second-class mail."

He is concerned about the cut rates for charitable institutions and realizes what a large burden such rates impose on Post Office Department finances. He does not know the answer and is aware of all the controversy which greets every effort to raise charity rates, but he hopes to find a solution.

A DISTINCTIVE TOUCH

Like every other Senator, Chairman MONRONEY has a press secretary. She is Mrs. Beth Short, widow of Joe Short, who was

press secretary to President Harry S. Truman. Mrs. Short has a solid newspaper background herself, but her duties are a little different from most Senate press aids.

For one thing, Senator MONRONEY writes his own speeches and press releases. He doesn't just dictate them, he types them himself. Behind his desk there is a typewriter—an ancient L. S. Smith which he dug up and had restored at a cost probably greater than a new electric machine. He is delighted with it.

There may be other Senators who are touch typists but probably Senator MONRONEY is the only one who bats out copy on an old standard model. Mrs. Short sometimes feels like a copy girl as she processes speeches and releases "takes" hot off the boss' typewriter. She indicated that the Senator's private office is not unlike a newsroom as a deadline nears.

If the next postal rate law is written at least in part on that L. C. Smith, newspapermen can at least take comfort that it was done by a city room alumnus who remains at heart a newspaperman.

INCOME TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Stewart Alsop points out some facts about the loopholes in our tax structure—facts which demonstrate how that structure favors the very rich, particularly those who have amassed their fortunes in certain businesses which enjoy a special tax status. There are many in the Senate, notably the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who have been pointing out the inequity of these loopholes for some time, but I think Mr. Alsop's brief essay is an especially pointed and concise statement of the problem. We must face up to the fact that we did not finish the job with last year's income tax cut and this year's excise tax cut. We still have some unfinished tasks of tax reform facing us. The long-range prospects for our economic system depend, among other things, on the existence of an equitable tax structure. Something is wrong when it turns out that the man who earns \$5,000 a year is paying a greater percentage of this income in Federal taxes than the man who earns \$5 million annually. And something is even more wrong when it turns out that the man who earns \$5,000 a year is actually paying more money in taxes than the man who earns \$5 million. These are documented facts. So that others may see Mr. Alsop's remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW BIG RICH—A POSTSCRIPT

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—A good many years ago George Kennan, then chief of the State Department's policy planning staff, suggested that I look up a certain Russian refugee in New York. The man was intelligent, Kennan said; he had been a major Communist functionary in the Soviet Union, and he knew a lot about how the system really worked.

The next time I was in New York I telephoned the Russian, and he asked me to dinner, giving a rich-sounding Park Avenue address. A maid dressed in Mary Petty style ushered me into a handsomely furnished

duplex apartment, and I sat down to a memorable meal, with two good wines, followed by a really impressive brandy.

Over the brandy and cigars, the Russian remarked that when he arrived in the United States a few years before, he had only the clothes on his back and one \$5 bill. "Then how in the world?" I asked—and finished the question by gesturing at the opulent surroundings.

"Very simple," said the refugee in his heavy accent. "In Communist Russia, way to get ahead is to be a Communist, so naturally I am a Communist. In capitalist America, way to get ahead is to be a capitalist, so naturally I am a capitalist."

So he was. Using a little borrowed money and a lot of foresight, he had acquired for a song an option on some mothballed World War II freighters and started a coal-shipping business. Then, under the Marshall plan, the United States began shipping coal to Europe on a vastly greater scale than ever before—and the Russian's business did so well that, when I saw him, he was worth several million dollars.

In recent months, while working on an article on "America's New Big Rich," which appeared in the last issue of the Post, I often recalled George Kennan's Russian friend. For what he said is quite true. If getting ahead and getting rich are the same thing, then "in capitalist America, the way to get ahead is to be a capitalist."

In a capitalist society there is surely nothing wicked about being a capitalist. Aside from being interesting and original human beings, the six men who were the subjects of my article—who have made an average of \$200 million in the last 20 years—created thousands of jobs in the process of enriching themselves. And yet the months I spent on the trail of the new rich raised certain questions in my mind about the tax structure which, in many ways, determines how the American capitalist system really works.

Under the present tax structure there are two ways a man can become a major capitalist. He can invent a useful new product, patent it, market it and enjoy a Government-protected monopoly for the life of his patents. One of the men I wrote about—Dr. Edwin Land, who invented the Polaroid camera—became very rich in this way. A great inventor like Dr. Land has an indisputable right, recognized for generations, to the protection of the patent laws.

The five other men I wrote about became rich in the second, and much more usual, way. They piled up huge fortunes in certain businesses—notably oil, insurance, savings-and-loan and real estate—all of which have one thing in common. They all provide useful tax shelters. These days, in order to build a really big fortune, a man must be what Howard Ahmanson's nephew once called Ahmanson, the immensely rich California savings-and-loan man—"a genius at tax law." Either that, or he must hire a genius for a tax lawyer. One of the chief secrets of becoming very rich is to avoid—quite legally, of course—paying heavy income taxes, or even, in some cases, any income tax at all.

I did not ask my six rich men what income tax they paid. A man's income tax is his own business—and the business of the Internal Revenue Service—and if I had asked them, they would have told me, quite rightly, to go to hell. But it was not really necessary to ask. Certain statistics compiled by the Treasury Department tell the income tax story of the new big rich, as a class.

These statistics show that the man with an "adjusted gross income" (income after business and other deductions) of \$1 million a year pays, on the average, a smaller proportion of his income in taxes than the \$50,000-a-year man. The man with an adjusted gross income of \$5 million a year, in turn, typically pays a smaller proportion than the \$1-million-a-year man.

The Treasury statisticians based their study on the year 1959, when the top income tax rate (which literally nobody paid) was supposedly 91 percent. In the Kennedy-Johnson tax reduction passed by Congress last year, the top bracket was cut back to 70 percent. This was a useful step in the right direction. No man in his senses would risk his capital if he had to absorb all losses, while the Government picked up \$9 out of \$10 of profit. Thus, if taxes had really been paid at the rates established in the tax tables, the capitalist system would have collapsed.

But even a 70-percent top tax rate puts an enormous premium on finding tax loopholes. A capitalist has a right to expect a reasonable return in "keeping money" for risking his capital. According to experts, if the chief loopholes were closed, the top bracket could be cut to 50 percent without loss of revenue, and 50 percent is surely not confiscatory. Then a genuinely progressive tax system, based on ability to pay, could be restored. But the most important loophole closing reforms were knocked out of the Kennedy-Johnson program by Congress. Our progressive income tax system therefore remains what it has been for years—a myth.

Our loophole ridden tax system as it now operates gives the tax sheltered businesses a big advantage over less favored businesses. It thus has a distorting effect on the national economy. But what is much more important, the system is unfair in human terms.

The man who uses money to make money keeps far more of it than the unfortunate fellow who uses his brains or his talents to earn a salary in a company or a taxable income in one of the professions. But the unfairness does not end there. For example, a very rich man who has inherited his money can put it in tax-free bonds and pay no income tax at all, while a man with two dependents, earning a mere \$5,000 a year, has to pay almost a tenth of his income to the Government. This is not only unfair—it is grossly unfair.

Gross unfairness can be very dangerous in a democracy, particularly if the economy runs into real trouble. In that case, the unfairness could endanger the capitalist system itself—a system which, for all its faults, has worked better than any other.

Fe (Em) Church THE DANGERS OF BOMBING HANOI

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Republican calls to bomb Hanoi do not serve the cause of a rational foreign policy for our country in Vietnam. In its July 19 issue Newsweek published a well-reasoned column by Walter Lippmann on this subject. As Mr. Lippmann convincingly warned:

It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the President face-to-face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARD LESSON

(By Walter Lippmann)

A very substantial majority of the people, upward of 80 percent according to the Gallup and Harris polls, support the President on Vietnam. Yet, the White House and the State Department cannot, I feel sure, fail to

be reading into these returns the provisional and conditional nature of the popular support. It rests almost entirely on the hope that the President's policy will succeed, on the belief that the President is in a better position to judge than is anyone else, on dislike of any alternatives thus far proposed, and the patriotic feeling that in time of trouble good citizens should rally around the President.

But while the President's supporters are a large majority, the quality of their support is fragile. To keep it the President must make good in Vietnam itself, and not merely in his arguments with congressmen and journalists. There are important signs that, as the situation in Vietnam becomes worse, the Republican support of the President is breaking up. Senator DIRKSEN by himself is no longer able to deliver the Republicans. Congressmen LAIRD and FORD, following the Goldwater line, are preparing a trap for the President which it will not be easy for him to avoid. Nothing that has come from the liberal opponents has anything like the bite of the Laird-Ford opposition.

FORMULA FOR VICTORY

Messrs. LAIRD and FORD start from the position which President Johnson has arrived at—that a military victory is impossible, that all we can hope for is a stalemate to be followed by the negotiation of a compromise settlement. If that is the best the President wants, they say, it is not worth the commitment of a large mass of American soldiers and the inevitable casualties of a prolonged guerrilla war. This puts the Republican activists in opposition to a big land war in Asia, which is undoubtedly the real sentiment of the mass of our people. However, while the mass of our people do not want a big land war, they do want something that looks like a victory. Messrs. LAIRD and FORD offer them a formula for victory. It is to bomb North Vietnam from the air and keep the GI's out of the foxholes.

The Laird-Ford formula is superficially so plausible and so attractive that the President is going to have a hard time refusing to try it. As long as he does not bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, he will be unable to prove to the country that Messrs. LAIRD and FORD did not have the magic formula for achieving everything we want without paying much of a price for it.

There is, however, no magic formula. There is no reason whatever to think that the destruction of Hanoi and Haiphong would bring the war in South Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. For nearly 6 months our bombers have been moving north, and Hanoi has been put on notice that the bombers can do and may do just what Messrs. LAIRD and FORD now say they should do. There has not been a quiver from Hanoi to suggest that the North Vietnamese would pay even a small price to avoid the bombing. On the contrary, there is much evidence that their will to fight has grown harder.

It is most probable that if the President followed the Laird-Ford line, he would find that the North Vietnamese Army, which is a very good one, intervened not only by infiltration, as now, but in force. It is not improbable, moreover, that if we destroyed the missile sites and the oil tanks and storage depots of North Vietnam, the Soviet Union would step up its aid to make good the important losses. This would bring the President face-to-face with Moscow and produce a worldwide crisis.

At some point, the President and his advisers are going to have to ask themselves why everything goes wrong—be it under Henry Cabot Lodge or Maxwell Taylor—why over the years all our hopes have been dashed and one plan after another has failed. It is not that we have not tried. It is not that the military and civilian leaders have not been efficient and faithful in their specialties. It is, I believe, that we have set ourselves a

July 19, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16657

task, which, like squaring the circle or perpetual motion or living 200 years, is impossible to do. It is an impossible task for the United States to reach across the Pacific Ocean and to determine what shall be the constitutional foundations of a country in Asia, or by force of American arms to assure a weak country that it will be non-Communist, self-governing and independent of its enormously big neighbor.

To say that something ought to be done does not make it possible to do it. That is a hard lesson to learn. It is a hard conclusion for politicians to admit. But it is one of the lessons every nation, like every individual, has in the course of time to learn.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the fate of the captive nations is the most heart-rending legacy of the last war and one of the heaviest burdens that presses upon the conscience of free world leadership. The tragedy is that today the free world is in no better position to help these nations than at any time during the last 20 years. Their situation poses a great human dilemma, perhaps one of the greatest such dilemmas in modern history.

It is sad that while the free world won a triumphant victory over its deadly Nazi and Fascist foes, more than 100 million people in central and eastern Europe fell under the steamroller of Communist totalitarianism. Deliberately, treacherously, and in flagrant violation of its wartime pledges, the Government of the Soviet Union imposed its iron rule over peoples living in areas from the Baltic to the Black Sea. For two decades these peoples, including 17 million Germans in East Germany, have been separated from the free West.

All the efforts made by the governments of the free world have not brought about any change in the lot of captive nations. But we in this country are firmly determined to do all we can to have these nations freed. We have also resolved to keep the issue before the public by annually observing Captive Nations Week, in pursuance of a joint congressional resolution passed in 1959 and annual Presidential proclamations. I am indeed happy to raise my voice in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week.

CALIFORNIA COTTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Commodity Credit Corporation will shortly own 10 million bales of cotton. I am proud to note that very little of this surplus will be California cotton which is efficiently grown and has remained competitive in both the domestic and world markets. Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government.

Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the declining use of cotton by our textile industry. If cotton is not to be completely replaced by synthetics, there is a need for an encouragement of the production of quality cotton. There is also the need to relieve the already overburdened taxpayer from having to pay for supports on cotton that is not

of sufficiently high quality to be used in our high-speed and efficient modern textile mills. That is why I made known my support for the Agricultural Act of 1964 as it pertained to cotton when it was before the Senate in March 1964. There were some provisions in that legislation which I questioned, but I keenly believed that our cotton industry needed an opportunity to revitalize itself so that it could once again become competitive.

The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives has now reported an omnibus farm bill, H.R. 9811, which contains some useful provisions to encourage the production of quality cotton. I hope my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Agriculture will continue to give this question the deep study which they have been giving it so that at long last quality cotton production may be encouraged in America.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a telegram which I have just received from Mr. John P. Benson, president of the Western Cotton Growers Association, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JULY 19, 1965.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

California cotton has not caused the pileup in carryover and Government-held stocks which has created the crisis in the cotton industry.

It is estimated that on August 1 of this year, the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation will own 10 million bales of cotton. This is one of the largest supplies of cotton ever held or owned by any government or corporation. And practically none of it will be California cotton.

Last year only about 1½ percent of California's cotton was taken over by the Government. The figures for most other States was 50 to 85 percent. This simply means that the American textile mills did not buy all that cotton and the Government had to.

As we pointed out at the Senate hearings, quality is one of the keys both to increased cotton consumption and to the mounting pile of Government-owned cotton. On the one hand, if more quality cotton were produced more cotton as a whole and less synthetics would be used. On the other hand, the production of cotton which the textile mills pass over contributes both to the increase of Government-owned stocks and the increase in the use of synthetics.

I urge you to vigorously present these facts when cotton legislation comes before the Senate for consideration.

Regards,

JOHN P. BENSON,

President, Western Cotton Growers Association.

Je [Signature] Bayh
PROFESSORS SUPPORT VIETNAM
POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a statement strongly supporting the administration's policy in Vietnam has just been issued by 67 professors from various American colleges and universities. Although this document was circulated at the end of the academic year when many instructors had left their campuses, it is signed by a number of distinguished political scientists, historians, economists, and other faculty members.

At this critical period it is reassuring to have this positive assessment by experts in international affairs about the course we are now pursuing. These professors assert that in their opinion—

U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this statement, together with the list of signers, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM BY POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AND OTHERS

To dispel the notion that any small but active and vocal groups of teachers and students speaks for the entire academic community on the problem of Vietnam, we the undersigned feel it necessary to make clear our support for the policies of President Johnson. We do not believe the U.S. policy in Vietnam has been free from errors, but its infallibility is not at issue. At issue are its relevance, realism, and morality. We believe U.S. policy in Vietnam is consistent with the realities of the situation, the goals of American foreign policy, and the peace and freedom of South Vietnam.

"We strongly desire peace in Vietnam and a political settlement of the war achieved through negotiation among responsible parties. We regret the involvement of American troops in a foreign war. We believe the President shares these commitments and regrets. We believe in the good faith of his reiterated desire to seek a political settlement of this war through negotiation, any time, anywhere, with any responsible parties.

We ardently support social, political and economic reform in Vietnam and elsewhere, and welcome all efforts to achieve representative institutions, economic opportunity, personal freedom and a higher standard of living for all. We believe that the present Democratic administration has made clear its dedication to progress in Vietnam by its very substantial development program and its promise of massive assistance when the cessation of hostilities makes possible full concentration of the Vietnamese people on the job of development.

We believe that war is a gruesome travesty on civilized decisionmaking and that the war in Vietnam is a hideous burden on the people of that nation. However, we also know—for this is a matter of evidence, not of opinion—that the war in South Vietnam resulted not from a spontaneous outburst of popular unrest, not from American invasion, but from the deliberate exportation by Hanoi of waves of troops trained in the tactics of terrorism and guerrilla warfare. Aggression from the North is not merely a cliché in a propaganda war; it is combat-ready soldiers, trained and equipped by Hanoi, armed with modern weapons, and Mao's strategy for the subjugation of a peasant population. We regard it as exceedingly significant that no major population group in South Vietnam supports, or has supported, the Vietcong.

Confronted with the sharp escalation of Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam, the U.S. Government had available a limited number of alternatives:

The United States might have sued for peace and met Hanoi's reiterated demand for withdrawal of all American support to South Vietnam. It would thereby have permitted South Vietnam to be integrated into the totalitarian Leviathan to the north, and have abandoned tens of thousands of South Vietnamese who have resisted totalitarian ex-

July 19, 1965

pansion to liquidation as enemies of a new Communist ruling class.

The United States might have done nothing, and permitted its own forces and those of South Vietnam to be defeated by Hanoi's enlarged forces. This course would have added humiliation to withdrawal, would have enhanced the "paper tiger" image of the United States, as well as have consigned South Vietnam to totalitarianism.

The United States might have launched an all-out war against North Vietnam and destroyed that nation's cities and industrial capacity utterly and precipitously.

The United States might have begun a restrained increase of its military effort, designed to escalate the price of aggression and enhance the incentives for peaceful settlement.

Among the unsatisfactory and limiting choices available, we believe the President chose wisely. We support his continued efforts to find a political settlement that will achieve peace and freedom for South Vietnam.

Finally, we reject the bizarre political doctrine that President Johnson or his principal advisors have special obligations to the academic community. Obviously, the administration has obligations to explain its policies to the American people. But to suggest that some group of university professors has a right to a special accounting is as outrageous as to suggest that the corporation executives of America, the plumbers, the small businessmen, or the barbers have special claims on the Government and its principal spokesmen. It is a fundamental principle of democracy that all categories of citizens are equal under law, and that neither wealth, nor class, nor expertise entitles a citizen to preferred treatment by his Government.

Ulrich S. Allers, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Dean Stephen Bailey, Maxwell School of Citizenship, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.; Corner Clay, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Joseph Cooper, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; George Demetriou, Director, Institute for the Comparative Study of Political Systems, Washington, D.C.; Martin Diamond, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Eleanor Lansing Dulles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Valerie A. Earle, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; John T. Everett, Jr., Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Mark F. Ferber, Assistant professor, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers—the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Victor C. Ferkliss, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Richard M. Fontana, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert W. Foster, professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Carl Friedrich, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Wayne E. Fuller, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Stephen P. Gilbert, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Walter I. Giles, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Joseph B. Graus, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Richard Greer, executive director, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., 4000 Albemarle Street, NW, Washington, D.C.; Ernest S. Griffith, dean of the School of International Service, American University, Washington, D.C.

George D. Haimbush, Jr., associate professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Morton H. Halperin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; John F. Haltom, Texas Chris-

tian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Donald G. Herzberg, professor of political science, director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, N.J.; Samuel Huntington, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Jan Karski, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; James E. Larson, professor of political science, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; J. R. Leguey-Felleux, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Karl H. Lery, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Michael F. M. Lindsay, professor, far eastern studies, American University, Washington, D.C.; Benjamin E. Lipincott, professor of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Seymour Martin Lipset, professor, political science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; George A. Lipsky, professor, political science and geography, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; Kurt L. London, professor, international affairs director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.; Charles Burton Marshall, Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, Washington, D.C.; Neil A. McDonald, professor, political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; John H. McDonough, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Franz Michael, professor, international affairs, associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Warren Miller, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; S. D. Myres, professor, department of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; William V. O'Brien, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; George R. Osborne, department of political science, Douglass College, New Brunswick, N.J.; Robert E. Osgood, School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.; Roland I. Perusse, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Charles W. Procter, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Lucian W. Pye, professor, political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.; George H. Quenter, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Charles H. Randall, Jr., professor of law, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

Emmette Redford, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.; Warren A. Roberts, professor, political science and economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; A. A. Rommer, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Harold W. Rood, department of political science, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.; Paul Seabury, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Joseph S. Sebes, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Warren Shearer, professor of economics, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.; August O. Spain, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.; Melvin P. Straus, associate professor of government, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.

Susan Tallman, political analyst, Operations & Policy Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Donald Tacheron, associate director, American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.; N. H. Timmons, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Procter Thomson, professor, economics and administration, Claremont Men's

College, Claremont, Calif.; Richard L. Walker, director, institute of international studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Donald B. Weatherbee, assistant professor, Institute of International Studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.; Clyde Winfield, chairman, professor of history, Texas Western College, El Paso, Tex.; Gerard F. Yates, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; I. William Zartman, associate professor, institute of international studies, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, our stake in Vietnam grows daily. Involved is our Nation's pledge to an ally and the freedom of the free world as well. The times could hardly be more serious.

Against this background, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two editorials, one from the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal and the other from the Christian Science Monitor.

The Evening Journal editorial emphasizes that three Presidents have committed this country to help South Vietnam and "for this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others, it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster."

The Christian Science Monitor editorial outlines what it calls "three moral and practical obligations" of the administration; namely "to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won"; "to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them"; and "to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity."

Because they are so timely, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials entitled "Our Word Is at Stake" and "All the Facts on Vietnam" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Journal, July 15, 1965]

OUR WORD IS AT STAKE

For those who have failed to realize the gravity of the situation in Vietnam, President Johnson's statements at his press conference on Tuesday should be enlightening. We have in mind not only the military position, which has been deteriorating; we are thinking of the nature of this Nation's commitment.

The war has been going against the South Vietnamese forces at an accelerating pace since the start of the monsoon season. Vietcong concentrations of a size not seen until this year have overrun important towns; Government units in battalion strength have been ambushed and virtually wiped out; even in the neighborhood of Saigon troop movements are hazardous. More and more American strength has been thrown into the struggle in order to bolster South Vietnamese resistance.

Meanwhile the bombing of bridges and military installations in North Vietnam by American aircraft, more often without South Vietnamese support than with it, has been

intensified. Our planes have been ranging north of Hanoi and not far from the Chinese border. But the damage has not prevented the Vietcong from stepping up their offensive.

Now President Johnson says that new dangers and difficulties in Vietnam and increased aggression from North Vietnam may require a greater American response on the ground. So it is "quite possible that new and serious decisions will be necessary in the near future." If many more troops are to be sent, steps will be required to "insure that our reserves of men and equipment remain entirely adequate for any and all emergencies."

That is, there may be a callup of Reserves. Congress may be asked to appropriate additional sums. Draft calls may be increased. To put it bluntly, this amounts to a partial mobilization—for the purpose of supporting an ally fighting a land war it cannot win alone.

This is a grim prospect. The decisions that may be necessary are unwelcome at best. More and more voices have been asking in recent weeks why the United States is in Vietnam. Some have been calling for withdrawal. For them the President had some sober words to explain why we will do what is necessary.

Three Presidents have undertaken to meet the request of the Government of South Vietnam for help against its enemies, in keeping with our pledge under the SEATO treaty. That is the legal and moral basis of our presence there, and to keep that commitment is now a matter of national honor. Our word is at stake.

Let no one underestimate the import of that statement. Let no one sneer at the President invoking the concept of national honor in justifying a further escalation of this undeclared war. For this Nation to fail to keep such a commitment is not only to insure the condemnation of others; it is to invite a whole series of costly consequences that could end in disaster.

There is only one way for the United States to avoid the hard decisions the President foresees. That is to give the Communists the victory—since they have made it clear that they will settle for nothing less. But would such a surrender purchase peace? We do not believe it. It would only encourage the aggressors to strike again and again. To deter them we must keep our word.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 16, 1965]

ALL THE EFFECTS ON VIETNAM

Now that the U.S. Government has made it clear that it is determined to achieve in Vietnam those military ends which it believes are right and necessary, Washington faces three moral and practical obligations. The first of these is to explain more convincingly to the American people and the world why Washington believes this war must be fought and won. The second is to tell the American people as fully and as frankly as is possible what this war will demand of them. The third is to win that war with the utmost speed consistent with decency and common humanity.

Although we understand and sympathize with the difficulties, both domestic and foreign, which President Johnson faces over Vietnam, we do not believe that any one of these three obligations are yet being met. Washington's explanations on American involvement in Vietnam have left far too many Americans—to say nothing of the rest of the world—confused, doubtful, and in many cases even indignant. Washington has deliberately refrained from telling the American people what the White House and the Pentagon well know; the cost of victory will be high, the road to victory hard and probably long. Finally, the present American buildup of

troops, bases, and material in Vietnam may not be adequate for even a long-drawn-out effort at victory, to say nothing of a swift and decisive effort to end the conflict.

At any time, anywhere, and under any circumstance war is a heart-rending human tragedy. But once a war is begun, the wisest and most merciful procedure is to win that war as quickly as is consistent with every humane consideration left the warrior.

Nor will anything be gained by failing to be utterly frank with the American people. If Vietnam is to require larger armed forces, a callup of reserve units, new military appropriations, the sooner and more fully the American people are told of this the better. At present, this news is coming out in dribs and drabs, in hints, in leaked stories and in other roundabout ways. It is little wonder that the American people seem uncertain and confused about what is going on.

We believe that the American aims of preserving South Vietnam's independence, of halting outside aggression, and of seeking a negotiated peace with honor and justice are right. But we also believe that these may well require greater sacrifices than Washington has yet admitted. It is high time that the White House made this plain.

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a year ago this month the University of Utah signed James C. Fletcher, a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp., and chairman of his own Space General Co., to be president of the university. During his first short year, President Fletcher has compiled an excellent record. All of us are proud of him.

I noticed in Nation's Business for July that he also has proffered some sound constructive suggestions for removing existing barriers between educators and businessmen and fostering a greater mutual understanding.

President Fletcher cites the apparent prejudice on the part of many educators toward the profit motive. At the same time he reminds those on campuses that there would be no large public universities without a prosperous business community.

To quote from the article:

More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking, it would be worth the effort," he adds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CAMPUS-EYE VIEW OF BUSINESSMEN—IT'S OFTEN UNFLATTERING BUT IT CAN BE IMPROVED, SAYS UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT JAMES C. FLETCHER

Businessman James C. Fletcher has learned a great deal since he became president of a major American university 1 year ago this month.

Some of the lessons have been reassuring, others disquieting.

He feels that on far too many college campuses, far too many professors are voicing inaccurate, unflattering, and outdated ideas about businessmen and the profit system, and the misconceptions are being passed

along to young people like a low-grade infection.

His observation is neither gratuitous nor casual, but the deliberate expression of one who is as much at home in the world of businessmen as he is in the world of academicians.

Before launching a highly successful electronics enterprise in the 1950's Dr. Fletcher was an instructor in cosmic ray physics at Princeton and Cal Tech. By the time he stepped into the presidency of the University of Utah at Salt Lake City last year he had become a vice president of Aerojet-General Corp. and chairman of his own company, Space General.

He concedes that he, too, had a strong prejudice against the profit motive when he left university life to enter business for the first time.

"I went into business to try it for a year," Dr. Fletcher recalls. "I stayed 15 years. In the process I gained a healthy respect for business, the role of profits in our society, and a new respect for the contribution businessmen make to America. Unfortunately, a lot of people in our colleges and universities have negative views on all of these points—unless, of course, you are talking about those departments of a university specifically geared to business."

On campus, he points out, it is often forgotten that the Nation's prosperity depends on business. "We wouldn't have large public universities if we weren't prosperous," he states, citing his own tax-supported 13,000-student institution as an example.

More often than not, the professorial attitude toward the businessman is equivalent to the portrait of the entrepreneur drawn by George Bernard Shaw in his plays, Dr. Fletcher has found.

"The businessman, as seen by Shaw, is typically hard-nosed, gruff, a 'blast the unions' and 'fire this guy if he's not up to capacity' type. That's the image university people quite often have. To many of them business is undignified and not a really useful pursuit."

To remove the wall of misunderstanding which often separates the educator and the businessman, Dr. Fletcher recommends much greater interchange of ideas. He has in mind two-way traffic because he feels that businessmen themselves are sometimes guilty of looking at higher education through the wrong end of the telescope.

One move that would help, he suggests, is for businessmen to invite more university professors to serve on corporate boards of directors. Doing this, the businessman would hear questions raised and points of view expressed that otherwise are missing in a typical business setting. Some of this thinking could be useful as well as refreshing, the 46-year-old educator asserts.

ADVISORY BOARDS URGED

Another step he recommends is the creation of more industrial advisory boards to universities. Among other things, these boards—comprised of businessmen—would help schools of higher learning bring their curriculums realistically into line with the needs of industry. "This is already being done to some extent," he says, "but there is room for more of the same."

Dr. Fletcher says the curriculum planners have to be especially careful in these days of rapidly changing technology. At his own school the faculty was about to give a course in a certain technical field until a check with industry showed that the field was already obsolete.

More contact with industry would provide university people with the opportunity of seeing firsthand what the businessman is up against, Dr. Fletcher believes. "If the exposure did nothing more than offset the bias against profitmaking it would be worth the effort," he adds.

July 19, 1965

16660

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

VICE PRESIDENT SPEAKS ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the pros and cons of the establishment of a Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development have received considerable public debate. A recent guest editorial in the Saturday Review magazine provided an informative statement by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY on the subject.

I found the Vice President's remarks deserving of close attention by the Members of Congress, for, as he pointed out, he has been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers in an effort to determine effective programs to meet the urgent demands facing our cities.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record this article, "Making Cities Fit for People," as contained in the July 3, 1965, issue of Saturday Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAKING CITIES FIT FOR PEOPLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following guest editorial, by the Vice President of the United States, discusses the proposed Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development.)

Robert Herrick said in the 17th century that great cities seldom rest: if there be none to invade from afar, they will find worse foes at home. We know those foes today. They are slums, crime, a lack of playgrounds and parks, overburdened schools, inadequate transportation, crowding, lack of clear air, and inequality of opportunity.

It was only 45 years ago that people in American cities first began to outnumber people on our farms. By 1960 only 11 States had more rural than urban population.

But most of these States will not remain that way very long. The urban population of North Dakota, our most rural State in 1960, jumped 35 percent in the 1950's. Alaska's urban population increased 150 percent, and three other States—Arizona, Florida, and Nevada—more than doubled their urban population during this period.

By 1970 we can expect that three-fourths of our people will be living in towns, cities, and suburbs, compared to 70 percent in 1960. Most of our people will be concentrated in metropolitan areas. At the end of 1964, two-thirds of our population lived in 219 such areas, an increase from 59 percent in 1950. By 1980 that proportion will increase to three-fourths, and by the year 2000 to four-fifths.

There have been several patterns of metropolitan growth. One has been mass migration from farm to city. One has been mass migration of Negroes out of the South—virtually all of it to central cities. Another has been mass migration of middle- and upper-income people from the core city to the suburb. And great growth has come from a higher birthrate and from longer life expectancy.

This growth has imposed new and unprecedented burdens on local government for schools, housing, streets and highways, commercial expansion, transit, and welfare programs.

In the past 10 years, State and local debt has more than doubled, while Federal debt has risen only 15 percent.

State and local government employment jumped from 4,600,000 in 1953, to more than 7 million employees in 1963. During the same decade, State and local public expenditures more than doubled, increasing by 132 percent to \$65 billion in 1963. Major among

these were expenditures on transportation, education, highways, sanitation, and parks and recreation, with increases from 140 percent to 165 percent during the 10 years. Interstate and State and local public debt jumped by 268 percent.

Along with these sharp rises in costs of public services and facilities, the growth of these urban areas has also created explosive racial and economic pressures.

I remember during my two terms as mayor of Minneapolis, at the close of World War II, the strains placed on our city by changing population patterns. Those strains were small compared to those today. Example: In the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area, nearly three-fourths of the people lived in 1950 within the city limits. Today those cities' populations remain constant, while population in their suburbs has more than doubled. The same pattern is common to nearly all our major metropolitan areas.

The picture is clear: There has been a shift of middle and higher income groups into the suburbs, out of the taxing jurisdictions of the inner city, while too many of the poor and disadvantaged have remained behind or moved in from the poorer rural areas.

Although the suburbs have provided cheaper land and lower cost housing for many middle-income families, as well as for the more prosperous, they have been populated largely by those able to afford better housing. Those at or near the poverty level have remained concentrated in the slums and poorer sections of the central city. Faced with deterioration and decay, the inner city has found itself with greater tasks to undertake and with fewer ready sources of money. At the same time, the suburbanites have had their hands full creating public facilities and services in communities that were open grass fields a few years ago.

Behind the statistics and population patterns have been thousands of personal and community tragedies, many of them created by those of good intention. There are the impersonal housing projects that in many cases have displaced families and destroyed the traditional fabric of neighborhood life. There are the freeways that have torn through people's homes and businesses, cut through parkland, and done no more than add to the noise in our streets and poison in our air. There are the shortsighted zoning decisions that have blighted neighborhoods and reduced property values.

Because of these discouraging experiences, it would be easy to say that many of our metropolitan problems stem from apathetic or inept local government. In a few places this is true. But in most it is not.

I have been working, at President Johnson's request, with the Nation's mayors, county officials, and city managers. Almost without exception I have found these men and women to be dedicated, competent, and deeply concerned with the problems pressing on their constituencies. Most of them have long since initiated constructive programs of their own in an attempt to keep pace with the urgencies facing their cities. But they have been fighting massive problems with dwindling resources. And they have not had any single place to turn for counsel and assistance.

One of their major difficulties, they tell me, is that no one Federal department or agency has had either authority or responsibility to work with mayors and county officials in areas where they need most help. Our mayors and county officials have not, in many instances, been able to get advice or a rapid answer in Washington—much less Federal funds.

In 1963 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identified over 40 separate programs of aid for urban development, administered by some 13 Federal de-

partments and agencies. Small wonder that the committee reported that "the effect of inconsistencies is felt most keenly in urban areas where programs of all kinds at all levels of government most frequently come together."

It cited particularly inconsistency and conflict between politics, or lack of them, in relocating people displaced by public activities. While a community plans for the relocation of people displaced from a renewal area, not infrequently still another public project, undertaken with Federal help, displaces additional numbers with no rehousing plan—and may even eliminate some of the housing urgently needed to meet the problem.

Jet airports may be announced in residential growth areas, driving down values of homes financed with Federal mortgage insurance or guarantees. A right-of-way for a federally aided highway may be purchased, cutting through an area that another agency is seeking to acquire and preserve as public parkland.

One test of democratic governments is its ability to respond rapidly to changing conditions.

In 1953 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created to provide top-level Federal policy and direction in meeting the human and social needs of our citizens. HEW treats, to a large degree, the symptoms of urban disease.

But until recently there has been no similar recognition of the need for a top-level Federal department to help meet the physical and environmental problems of metropolis—in many cases the causes of urban disease.

Today most of the key programs having to do with urban development, improvement, and housing are lodged at a secondary level of Government, in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This independent Agency was created in 1947, under President Truman, to administer the housing programs of the FHA and the Public Housing Administration as continuing peacetime activities. Since that time all manner of programs have been added to HHFA's responsibilities, including urban renewal, urban planning, mortgage supports, public works, college housing, mass transportation, open space, and housing for the elderly. Its broad major responsibilities now cover at least 10 distinct and definable areas of activity. If you add the many special programs administered under the Agency, the number would more than double. Its programs today involve some type of Federal support for more than \$70 billion in private and public investment in housing and urban development.

About 77 percent of this—more than \$54 billion—is private-housing mortgage investment insured by the FHA. Public housing accounts for about 10 percent—\$7 billion—in capital investment by local public bodies, secured by annual contributions pledged by the Federal Government. Federal grants reserved or committed for renewal of our urban areas total about \$4.5 billion, and loans for college housing nearly \$3 billion. Lesser amounts include loan or grant commitments for such programs as housing for the elderly, public works planning and construction, open space acquisition, urban planning assistance, mass transportation, and mortgage financing support for GI home loans.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency was never intended to fill its present job. It is a loosely knit instrument. According to law, three of its officials are appointed by the President and report directly to him. In a legislative sense, at least, there is no one official in command.

When the President meets with his Cabinet he cannot find out what or how the Federal Government is doing overall in assisting towns, cities, and metropolitan areas. The agency most concerned with these areas is not even represented at the Cabinet table.